National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

GAULS AT THE COURT OF THE EMPEROR:

A Prosopographical Study of the Service, Promotion, and Influence of Gauls in Rome and in the Imperial Service, 31 B.C. - A.D. 54

©

BY

BERNARD JOSEPH KAVANAGH

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY IN ANCIENT HISTORY.

DEPARTMENT OF CLASSICS

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL 1993

National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-315-88288-3

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: Bernard Joseph Kavanagh

TITLE OF THESIS: GAULS AT THE COURT OF THE EMPEROR: A Prosopographical Study of the Service, Promotion, and Influence of Gauls in Rome and in the Imperial Service, 31 B.C. - A.D. 54

DEGREE: Doctor of Philosophy

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1993

Permission is hereby granted to THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Bernard J. Kavanagh..........................

14 Glenridge Crescent
St. John's, Newfoundland A1A 1T5
Canada

Date: July 20, 1993

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled "GAULS AT THE COURT OF THE EMPEROR: A Prosopographical Study of the Service, Promotion, and Influence of Gauls in Rome and in the Imperial Service, 31 B.C. - A.D. 54" submitted by Bernard Joseph Kavanagh in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

D. Fishwick ......D Fishwick......
(Supervisor)

A.M. Small ....

R.C. Smith ......Richard C. Smith......

J.J. Rossiter ......J. J. Rossiter......

C. Small ....

A.A. Barrett ......A A Barrett......
University of British Columbia

Date: ......21st May, 93......

Dedication

For my parents,

Thomas and Margaret Kavanagh

St. John's, Newfoundland

ABSTRACT

Some modern historians of the Roman Empire have put forth a view that the contribution of natives of Gaul in the ruling class of the Empire was slight. This general statement may be true if one views the entire period of the Roman Empire, though it does not take into account the period of the Julio-Claudians when Gauls were well-represented both in number and influence in the court of the Emperor.

Under Augustus, Gauls played admittedly a minor role at his court. No sure evidence exists to say that anyone from Gaul served as a senator during the first principate. It has been argued that Cornelius Gallus, the first prefect of Egypt, was a Gaul though the proof is, by no means, conclusive.

The first senators who were unquestionably of Gallic origin, D. Valerius Asiaticus, Cn. Domitius Afer and L. Iulius Graecinus, emerge during the reign of Tiberius. Asiaticus was the first to become a suffect consul while the other two only reached the praetorship. As many as ten other Gauls may have been senators at this time. Sex. Afranius Burrus also began his equestrian career during this reign.

Under Caligula, Domitius Afer was appointed suffect consul. For a brief time, Asiaticus was brother-in-law to the short-lived Emperor. Never before had a Gaul been so closely connected to the Imperial family. Later, Caligula married Milonia, whose half-brother, Cn. Domitius Corbulo, may also have been of Gallic origin. Asiaticus appears to have taken part in the successful conspiracy against Caligula.

At no time did Gauls flourish more at the Imperial court than under the Emperor Claudius. Natives of Tres Galliae were admitted into the Senate for the first time while senators from Narbonensis received further privileges. During this reign, Gauls controlled at various times the grain and water supply at Rome, the Praetorian Guard and the German armies. Claudius' decision to restore his son Britannicus over Nero was fatal for him. In reaction to this decision, a conspiracy was formed against him. This conspiracy was probably supported by many prominent Gauls who, although promoted by Claudius, now feared that the change of policy would jeopardize their interests.

Acknowledgements

I especially thank my supervisor, Dr. Duncan Fishwick, and the five other committee members for their recommendations and insight. Nothing could have been done at all without the tireless work of my typist, Mrs. Sharon Moroschan. My parents, my sister, Mary, my brothers, Michael and Timothy, and their families, my aunts, Ruth and Mame, gave me all the support I needed to keep going. **Maximas gratias vobis omnibus.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER PAGE

INTRODUCTION 1

1. AUGUSTUS 20
- Introduction 20
- Augustus and Gaul 22
- Gauls in Rome 30
- Augustus and the Promotion of Gauls in the Imperial Service 34
  - (T?) Cominius 34
  - T. and P. Carisius 35
  - Sex. Curvius Silvinus 36
  - C. Cornelius Gallus 38
  - C. Iulius Licinus 43
  - Celadus 46
  - Iccius 47
  - Iulius Graecinus/Iulius Procillus 48
  - L. Aponius 50
  - Sex. Aulienus 51
  - L. Aemilius Tutor 52
  - P. Usulenus Veiento 53
  - C. Iulius Macer 53
  - (Cn.?) Pompeius Trogus 54
- Conclusion 57

2. TIBERIUS 60
- Tiberius and Gaul 61
- The Senators 75
  - D. Valerius Asiaticus 75
  - Cn. Domitius Afer 77
  - L. Iulius Graecinus 80
  - P. Memmius Regulus 82
  - M. Porcius Cato 86
  - Cn. Domitius Corbulo 88
  - Q. Marius Celsus 92
  - Q. Curtius Rufus 93
  - Sex. Curvius Silvinus 95
  - Abudius Ruso 96
  - Togonius Gallus 99
- Gallic Equestrians 103
  - L. Aponius 103
  - Votienus Montanus 104
  - Iulius Africanus 106
  - Iulius Marinus; Iulius Celsus 107
  - Iulius Montanus 108
  - Sex. Afranius Burrus 109

CHAPTER PAGE

2. Continued
Narbonese Marriage Alliances? 112
C. Iulius Rufus 115
C. Iulius Victor 117
"Ignoti" 120
Conclusion 122

3. CALIGULA 126
Caligula's Relations with Gaul and its People 126
Gallic Senators and Equestrians under Caligula 130
M. Aponius Saturninus 130
D. Valerius Asiaticus 132
Cn. Domitius Afer 138
Cn. Domitius Corbulo 141
M. Porcius Cato 143
L. Iulius Graecinus 144
Gallic Involvement in the Plot against Caligula 147
Summary and Conclusion 157

4. CLAUDIUS 165
Claudius and the Gauls 168
Cn. Domitius Corbulo 169
Catonius Iustus 170
Q. Curtius Rufus 172
D. Valerius Asiaticus 173
M. Aper 175
C. Iulius Camillus 176
(T.?) Domitius Decidius 178
P. Clodius Quirinalis 180
M. Pompeius Silvanus Staberius Flavinus 180
D. Valerius Asiaticus 182
Cn. Domitius Corbulo 190
Q. Curtius Rufus 192
The Downfall of Messalina 192
Saufeius Trogus 193
The Decree of Claudius 194
L. Iulius Vestinus 197
M. (Iulius) Vestinus Atticus 198
D. Valerius Asiaticus 199
Iulius Vindex 201
M. Aper 203
Iulius Africanus 204
M. Iulius Romulus 205
Q. Iulius Secundus 208
Pompeius Paulinus 210
L. Annaeus Seneca, Paulinus' brother-in-law 211

CHAPTER PAGE

4. Continued
  - L. Duvius Avitus 212
  - C. Pompeius Longus Gallus 216
  - Cn. Domitius Afer 217
- Special Status for the Narbonese Senators 218
  - P. Pomponius Secundus 219
  - Sex. Afranius Burrus 220
  - Iulius Paelignus 223
  - Iulius Gallicus 224
  - M. Pompeius Silvanus 225
- The Death of Claudius 225
- Conclusion 228

CONCLUSION 246

ENDNOTES 253

BIBLIOGRAPHY 294

INTRODUCTION

In his ground-breaking work, Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome, A.N. Sherwin-White remarked of the gradual assimilation of Gauls into Roman society: "Down to A.D. 69, the admission of Gallic gentry into the Roman administrative class was proceeding normally"[1]. The assertion that the Gauls were amply, though not overly represented in the ruling and bureaucratic classes, is hardly what one might consider a controversial statement. Admittedly, there was an inherent prejudice against and fear of Gauls in Roman society, but in the case of so rich a country where the process of Romanization was relatively successful[2], at least among the native upper class, it would be more surprising if he had claimed that Gauls were not even minimally represented in the ruling élite.

However reasonable the statement may appear on the surface, other historians strongly argue against it. P. Garnsey and R. Saller, for example, claim that Sherwin-White's conclusion is unjustified and add that only "a mere handful of senators and equestrians [from Gaul] are known[3]". The same authors also dismiss the idea asserted by Petilius Cerialis in A.D. 69 (Tac., Hist. 4.72f), namely that by that time there were Gauls in command of Roman legions: "(Such) claims were hollow. They would have convinced few Romans"[4].

Garnsey and Saller are not alone in their argument that Gaul contributed only slightly to the Roman political and administrative elite. A. King writes in a similar vein, "Finally, how does Gaul compare with other provinces? Even urban southern Gaul did not obtain the overall level of wealth or political influence that was enjoyed by many Italian cities or by the Mediterranean ports of Spain, North Africa or the Near East. This can be illustrated by the number of Gallic citizens who became senators, following Claudius' decree that allowed them to do so[5]". King then offers statistics to show that, despite its size and resources, Gaul contributed only 3.1% of the senators and 4.2% of the knights.

Problems exist with these types of arguments. For example, in a field where our knowledge has great gaps, statistics, based on the little we happen to know, do not take into account evidence not yet uncovered. Also, the statement that even southern Gaul did not enjoy a great level of political influence can hardly be taken as unequivocally true; it is an opinion, which, is still subject to further investigation and debate.

As part of a debate, therefore, this thesis will now submit facts and arguments which by and large counter what has become the prevailing modern opinion, namely that Gaul's contribution to the governing class of the Roman Empire (and hence its effect on official policy) was slight. The study will examine the lives of Gallic individuals of the upper classes, probing in particular the connections which many of them forged both in the Senate and the army, whose soldiery had been recruited largely (though by no means exclusively) from Gaul; thereafter a conclusion will be drawn based on the contribution of all of them collectively. In other words, the thesis will be both prosopographical and sociological in nature.

As regards definitions and limits, the term "Gaul" or "Gallic" is used throughout in a broad sense to refer to anyone who was native to one of four provinces of Gaul, i.e., Narbonensis, Aquitania, Lugdunensis, and Belgica, including Germania Inferior and Superior. (Cisalpine Gaul will not be included here, since by the time of Augustus [Strabo 5.1.3f.] that region was considered part of Italy.) The term "Gaul" then could refer to a native Celt or descendant of a Celt but it could also refer to a Ligurian from the south-eastern coast of the Mediterranean, a Greek from Massilia or one of its colonies, a Basque-speaking Aquitanian or a German from one of the Germaniae or even Belgica, or, lastly, a descendant of Italian colonists. By and large, however, it is the most numerous group, i.e., the Celts, which plays the greatest role in this discussion.

Chronologically, the thesis will focus on the period from 31 B.C., the beginning of Augustus' reign, down to the end of Claudius' in A.D. 54. A chapter will be devoted to each reign and the discussion will cover the relationship which successive Emperors developed with Gaul and the prominent natives of the country who emerged historically or epigraphically during that reign. Each individual Gaul, whether of senatorial or equestrian rank, will be examined, to the extent that the evidence permits, with regard to his avenue of promotion or access to the Imperial court, the influence he enjoyed and the contacts, if any, which he maintained with other Gauls in Rome or in the Imperial service. All of these men and their achievements will be assessed for each reign and a conclusion made on their overall contribution as a group. First, however, as background to the period from 31 B.C. - A.D. 54, there will be a discussion of the conquest of Gaul, the process of Romanization there and the pre-Imperial precedent for Gallic promotion in Roman society. This will partly expose the anti-Gallic atmosphere and sentiments which often greeted Gauls in Rome during the period of the Julio-Claudians.

The Conquest of Gaul

The Roman conquest of Gaul was executed in two distinct military stages. The first in 125-120 B.C. established control along the Mediterranean shore, while the second in 58-52 B.C. completed the task, bringing Roman rule north to the English Channel and as far east as the Rhine. The earlier of the two great campaigns was prompted by incursions into the territory of Massilia, Rome's oldest ally, by their Ligurian neighbors, the Salluvii. According to C. Ebel, the Salluvii themselves had probably been encouraged or even ordered to strike at Massilia by the Arverni, a very powerful Celtic tribe from Aquitania which was extending its influence to the Mediterranean and saw Massilia as the only real obstacle in its drive for greater regional control[6]. The Massiliots, unable to fend off the attacks, then requested assistance from Rome, which obliged readily.

In 126 B.C., the consul M. Fulvius Flaccus set out against the Salluvii (Livy, Epit. 60). Although there is no historical record of the time or place of the actual engagements, the Fasti Triumphales reveal that in 123 B.C. Flaccus was rewarded with a triumph over the Salluvii proper, Ligurians in general and the Vocontii[7],a Celtic or Celto-Ligurian tribe whose principal centres were later Vasio (the modern Vaison-la-Romaine) and Lucus Augusti (Luc-en-Diois). However successful these victories were at the time, the Romans found it necessary in that same year, 123 B.C., to defeat the same three tribes again, this time under the leadership of C. Sextius Calvinus (Livy Epit. 61)[8]. Livy further reports that Calvinus then established a colony in that area around a mineral-water source and named it, Aquae Sextiae, after himself. According to Diodorus, Sextius sold many of the defeated tribesmen into slavery, though as many as 900 of them were released after it was learned that they had supported the Romans and Massiliots (Diod. 34.23).

The Salluvii and Vocontii, although relatively formidable, were only small players in comparison to the larger tribes, that is the Allobroges and the Arverni, to whom they were at the very least allied, but more likely subject. According to Livy, Toutomotulus, the king of the Salluvii had fled and taken refuge among the Allobroges, an important nation which inhabited the north-east of what became Gallia Narbonensis and whose principal centres included Vienna (the modern Vienne) its metropolis and Genava (Epit. 61). The Allobroges refused to return the king and for that reason as well as the fact that they were devastating the territory of the Aedui, the foremost tribe of all Gaul and an ally of Rome, the Romans were forced to attack them. Under the proconsul Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, the Romans in 120 B.C. met and defeated a combined army of Allobroges and Vocontii around the site of Vindalium (perhaps the modern Vedene)[9], which properly is in the territory of yet another tribe, the Cavares. Strabo writes that Gallic casualties were very high (4.2.3).

In the same year, the remnants of the Allobrogian army was re-inforced by their allies, the Arverni and the newly-combined force put under the command of Bituitus, the Arvernan king. At a location near the confluence of the rivers Isara (Isère) and Rhodanus (Rhone), a second proconsul, Q. Fabius Maximus, defeated the Gauls and inflicted what are reported to be exceedingly heavy losses. The numbers themselves may well be exaggerated. Livy, for instance, maintains that as many as

120,000 Gauls were killed (Epit. 61), a number which, although seemingly inflated, is smaller than the 200,000 whom Strabo reports to have perished (4.1.11).

While the victories of Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus and Q. Fabius Maximus initiated Roman control of the territory which later became Gallia Narbonensis, they can hardly be said to have ensured it. Between 120 B.C. and the arrival of Iulius Caesar in 59 B.C., Roman supremacy in the area was challenged by a series of rebellions, especially, in 109 and 78 by the Vocontii[10], in 90 by the Salluvii (Livy, Epit. 73) and in 60 by the Allobroges (Livy, Epit. 103). A far greater crisis occurred in 103-101, instigated not by Gauls proper but by the Cimbri and Teutones, Germanic tribes which had invaded Gaul and northern Italy. Only after a number of setbacks did the consul C. Marius manage to defeat the Teutones and their allies the Ambrones at Aquae Sextiae, and later the Cimbri in northern Italy (Livy, Epit. 68). In essence, then, Rome in 120 B.C. officially became master of the southern tribes of Gaul. These included the Allobroges, the Vocontii and the Salluvii, whom it had defeated in battle, the Cavares, which, like the three above, inhabited lands on the east side of the Rhone, the Volcae Arecomici whose principal centres included Nemausus, Narbo and perhaps Baeterrae, the Volcae Tectosages whose metropolis was Tolosa and the Helvii, whose capital under the Romans was named Alba Helvorum and which, like the two Volcae, inhabited the region west of the Rhone. The rebellions and lack of secure boundaries, however, made Roman control of the area in the early years at best precarious.

The campaigns which led eventually to the conquest of the rest of Gaul began in 59 B.C. after Iulius Caesar had been appointed proconsul of Gallia Cisalpina, Gallia Narbonensis and Illyricum for a five year term. His first assault was directed against the Belgic Helvetii, who had requested permission to pass peacefully through his province in order to re-locate but whose real motive was perceived as seeking to claim the hegemony of all Gaul (Caes., B.G. 1.2). (Caesar had his own ulterior motive for initiating a campaign in Gaul, namely to improve his popularity in Rome[11].) After the Helvetii had been defeated, Caesar tried to maintain his influence in Gallic politics by attacking Ariovistus and the Germans who had been devastating the lands of the Aedui (roughly modern Burgundy), Rome's long-standing allies. This was obviously a very popular move in a country which had been forever plagued, so it seemed, by their closest neighbors, the Germanic tribes.

Now considered the most formidable man in Gaul, Caesar proceeded through the country, subduing all resistance that arose against his authority. Aside from his skills as a general, however, he was also a diplomat. Masterfully playing the game of internal Gallic politics, he won states to his side by the promise of gifts or, more importantly, by the defeat of a rival nation. After a number of years, however, it became obvious, even to his allies, that the Romans were not present in Gaul simply to solve long-standing internal disputes or quarrels but rather to entrench themselves there permanently. In 52 B.C. Vercingetorix, a nobleman of the Arverni, used growing fear of the power of Rome to rally almost every tribe in Gallia Comata[12] against Caesar and his occupying force (Caes., B.G. 7.76). He even attempted (apparently without success) to recruit the Allobroges (B.G. 7.64) since they, although under Roman rule for sixty years, were still the least affected by Roman ways (B.G. 1.6)[13].

Caesar first met the united Gallic force at Gergovia, a settlement of the Arverni (B.G. 7.34). After he had besieged the town, he attempted to storm it but was unsuccessful. He then led his troops to the territory of the Aedui, an allied state which was at that time wavering in its support for Rome. Within months, Caesar again met and besieged Vercingetorix, this time at Alesia (Alise-Ste-Reine)[14], in the territory of the Mandubii, a tribe situated between the Aedui and the Arverni. Although heavily outnumbered, Caesar was able to keep the Gauls contained within the fortress town and after the defeat of a contingent of Gauls who had been summoned to help, Vercingetorix was forced to surrender. While the victory of Q. Fabius Maximus may have initiated Roman rule in southern Gaul in 120 B.C., it was Caesar's victory at Alesia that effectively sealed the fate of the rest of the country. Caesar finally departed a year later in 51 B.C., leaving in place legates, notably Munatius Plancus and Marcus Brutus, to complete mopping up operations.

Romanization and Pre-Augustan Precedent for Gallic Promotion

Through the establishment both of colonies and of a successful trading network, the Greeks of Massilia were the first to introduce classical civilization to the Gauls. Agriculturally, the most important innovations were the cultivation of grapes and olives for the production of wine and oil[15]. Metal working likewise was begun and from that industry derived, among other things, the striking of coins as a means of measuring values[16]. Culturally, what had the most notable effect on Gaulish civilization was the employment of Greek letters; the earliest decipherable Celtic inscriptions are found in the Greek alphabet[17] (cf. Caesar, B.G. 1.29).

Gaul, then, had been already initiated in the ways of the Mediterranean world by the time the Romans first seized a foothold in the country in 120 B.C. The conquerors, however, intended to impose as Roman a face as possible on the region. The first method chosen was the establishment of citizen colonies. Although Livy writes that C. Sextius Calvinus established a colony at Aquae Sextiae after his victory over the Salluvii in 125 B.C. (Epit. 61), this information appears to be incorrect[18]; Pliny writes that it only had the status of an oppidum Latinum (Pliny, HN 3.36). No colony in Gaul (in fact none outside Italy) pre-dates the one established in 118

B.C. at Narbo, in south-western Gaul in the territory of the Volcae Arecomici. Established by Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus, the son of the man who had conquered the Allobroges[19] and L. Licinus Crassus who served as the co-ordinator for recruiting colonists in Italy, Narbo received citizens from Latium, Umbria, Picenum and Campania as its first colonists, who were then enrolled in the Pollian tribe[20]. Its constitution was set up exactly as that of Rome; the first two "consuls", i.e., duoviri, who were chosen, were the founders of the colony, Ahenobarbus and Crassus.

Besides the establishment of citizen-colonies, the process of Romanization also involved the enfranchisement of many native Gauls as a reward for military service and loyalty to Rome. The earliest generals who campaigned in Gaul, namely, Fulvius Flaccus, Sextius Calvinus, Fabius Maximus and Domitius Ahenobarbus had all employed Gallic auxiliaries and, when hostilities were finished, these generals became patrons to their Gallic soldiers. In that capacity, they often awarded Roman citizenship to the chiefs of the auxiliary units, men who were already members of the local Gallic aristocracy; these chiefs, then, as the first step to becoming Roman, adopted the nomen and usually the praenomen of their benefactors while maintaining their Celtic names as cognomina. This same practice was continued by Gauls who were enfranchised by subsequent Roman generals who campaigned there, especially C. Marius, C. Valerius Flaccus and Pompey the Great. In historical records, we have accounts of two such Gauls who received Roman citizenship as a reward for their military support. The earlier of the two instances occurred ca. 82 B.C. and is preserved in Caesar's Commentaries. One of Caesar's interpreters, C. Valerius Troucillus, was the son of C. Valerius Caburrus, a chief of the Helvii tribe, who had been enfranchised by the proconsul C. Valerius Flaccus (BG 1.47). Although Caesar does not reveal the exact circumstances, Caburus must have rendered assistance to Flaccus while the latter was campaigning somewhere in Gaul in 83 B.C.[21]. Caburus' other son, C. Valerius Donnotaurus, was killed in 52 B.C. when he led the Helvii against Vercingetorix' forces.

The second example is the grandfather of the Augustan historian, Pompeius Trogus. Justin, a third century writer, preserves epitomes of this Trogus, who declared that his grandfather, a Vocontian, had served under Pompey the Great in the Sertorian War. For his service he was enfranchised by Pompey, perhaps around 72 B.C. when that war came to an end. Trogus further states that his uncle commanded a cavalry unit under the same Pompey in the Mithradatic War (66-63 B.C.) and that his father held the position of secretary of correspondence and embassies under Iulius Caesar. Nipperly has suggested that Trogus' father and Cn. Pompeius, an interpreter who mediated between Caesar's lieutenant Q. Titurius and Ambiorix, king of the Germanic Eburones, were the same individual (BG 5.36)[22]. Against this, Klotz points out that Trogus' father's position was one demanding great confidence ('Vertrauenstellung') whereas the job of interpreter was of lesser importance. It is also true that, since Pompey the Great had been liberal in bestowing citizenship in Gaul, Pompeius became a relatively common name there[23], so it is not unlikely that Caesar might have two Romanized Gauls named Cn. Pompeius on his staff.

The Valerii Caburi and Pompeii Trogi are two historical examples of Gallic families who accepted Roman citizenship without abandoning their Celtic heritage, a point demonstrated by their maintenance of Celtic cognomina. Other similar names that are noted epigraphically in the Province are Pompeia the daughter of Toutodovix (CIL 12, 3252), Sextia Excingilla (CIL 12, 5008), L. Domitius Axiounus (CIL 12, 3215) and C. Valerius Camulatus, the son of Senorix (CIL 12, 2480). So many Gauls had in fact, become citizens in the early period after the conquest of the south, that in 70 B.C. Cicero proclaimed that Gallia Narbonensis was "plena civium Romanorum" (Font. 11); he did not mention, however, that a majority of those citizens were people whose culture and manners were still basically Gallic[24].

Iulius Caesar continued or perhaps extended the practice which had been already established by his liberal distribution of Roman citizenship. Numismatic evidence identifies at least two men who benefitted directly from Caesar: Iulius Duratius, no doubt the same individual referred to in the Commentaries as a Pictonian chieftain in alliance with Rome (BG 8.26) and Q. Iulius Togirix, a man otherwise unattested but who appears by virtue of the distribution of his coins to be a citizen of the Sequani[25]. Drinkwater suggests another probable beneficiary, C. Iulius Gedomo, the grandfather of C. Iulius Rufus who flourished early in the reign of Tiberius (CIL 13, 1036)[26]. Caesar, doubtless, enfranchised a great many other Gauls, so much so that by the time he left the country Iulius was the commonest Roman name used there.

For Gauls in an increasingly Romanized world, the importance of Roman citizenship cannot be overemphasized. It offered a number of judicial and commercial rights not available to peregrini; more importantly, the lack of it restricted any further promotion in Gallo-Roman society. Caesar's interpreters, C. Valerius Troucillus and Cn. Pompeius, for example, were employed on Caesar's staff not only for their communication skills but also because they were the sons of citizens. The same situation may be true of Pompeius Trogus' uncle who was put in charge of the cavalry unit in the Mithradatic War. If a Roman general had the choice of assigning command or some diplomatic responsibility, to either a Gaul with Roman citizenship or one without, most likely the former would be chosen.

The most impressive example of the promotion of Gauls in pre-Augustan Rome is that of the brothers, Roucillus and Egus, the sons of the long-time Allobrogian chieftain, Adbucillus (Caes., BC 3.59). According to Caesar, the brothers had offered valuable service both during the Gallic and Civil Wars. As a reward for their assistance, Caesar says that he had both enriched them with money and lands captured from enemies and ennobled them with offices of great prestige. Most importantly, it had been arranged that the two men be adlected extra ordinem (i.e., outside normal procedure) into the Roman Senate. One assumes that these men would have become senators had they not foiled their own promotion by embezzling money from their own cavalry unit and, on being discovered, defecting to Pompey's camp.

Caesar does not state whether the two brothers were Roman citizens, referring to them simply by their Gallic names, Roucillus and Egus. It is very likely, however, since they came from a prominent and presumably pro-Roman family Gallic family, that they must have already been enfranchised. Furthermore, Caesar writes that when the brothers defected, they settled in the camp of L. Domitius Ahenobarbus, a man whose family had close ties of patronage with the Allobroges[27]. Possibly then Adbucillus and his sons were also Domitii but Caesar, intentionally, refrained from giving their Roman name (Domitius or whatever) in order to de-Romanize them. They were after all traitors. In contrast to his treatment of Roucillus and Egus, he gives the Roman names of his loyal staff-officers, C. Valerius Troucillus, Cn.

Pompeius and of the fallen hero, C. Valerius Donnotaurus.

Caesar's intention to bring Gauls in the Senate is confirmed by Suetonius. In his biography of Iulius Caesar, he writes; (Caesar) ... quosdam e semibarbaris Gallorum recepit in curiam (Div. Iul. 76). Suetonius further confirms his own statement when he records a chant which had become popular in Rome after Caesar returned. He writes: Gallos Caesar in triumphum ducit, idem in curiam; Galli bracas deposuerunt, latum clavum sumpserunt (Div. Iul. 8).

In contradicting this idea, Wiseman does not deny that Caesar admitted men born in Gaul into the senate but denies that they were native Gauls, that is of non-Roman or non-Italian extraction. He argues, instead, that the men chosen were probably descendants of Italian negotiatores, a conclusion based on the names of two men whom he suggests were among Caesar's adlecti. The first of these is a certain (Co)minius Longinus (AE 1948, 65). Wiseman proposes that an ancestor or relative of this individual, whose fragmented name occurs in an inscription found near Rome, may be T. Cominius C.f., who served as duumvir, aedile and interrex of Narbo (CIL 12, 4389)[28]. The second suggested senator is T. Carisius, whose name is found at Avennio in an inscription identifying him as praetor Volcar(um) (CIL 12, 1028). Wiseman connects this T. Carisius with another individual of the same name who served in 45 B.C. as a triumvir monetalis, a senatorial office[29].

It is possible that these above-mentioned individuals may have been senators who originated from Gaul but were of Italian background. But one cannot claim on the basis of the evidence that Caesar did not also adlect native Gauls. Wiseman's argument ignores the testimony of Caesar himself, who wrote that he intended to admit the two Allobrogian brothers, Roucillus and Egus, men who were obviously not descendants of Italian businessmen. Furthermore, if the only ones chosen for the senate were descendants of Italian colonists, and since Romans of the late Republic will have certainly been capable of distinguishing native Gauls from descendants of Italian colonists born there, the sharp ethnocentric, anti-Gallic reaction reported by Suetonius makes very little sense.

If there were, then, Gauls other than Roucillus and Egus admitted to the senate, as Suetonius claimed, it is tempting to speculate on their identities. Two names which have already been mentioned and which are credible possibilities are Caesar's interpreter, C. Valerius Troucillus and his personal secretary, Cn. Pompeius Trogus. Both men possessed the qualifications and prerequisites which Caesar himself would have deemed necessary attributes for a Roman senator. The two were not only Roman citizens but the sons of citizens; each clearly came from pro-Roman families. In addition to this, their families were members of the Gallic aristocracy and hence their wealth could perhaps have equalled that of many Italian senators. Valerius and Pompeius both spoke Latin and, as far as we know, served Caesar with steadfast loyalty; unlike Roucillus and Egus, there is no record that the other two ever defected. Despite all these positive qualities, however, most Romans, with the memory of the sack of Rome in 390 B.C. still fresh in their minds, so Tacitus claims (Ann. 11.23), would have viewed men like Valerius Troucillus and Pompeius Trogus as descendants of enemies who still spoke a barbarian language and whose manners and customs were uncivilized. Although partly Romanized, these men would have been viewed as Galli semibarbari (Suet. Div. Iul. 76).

It is difficult to think that just two Gallic senators, Valerius and Pompeius, could alone have caused such a stir, both within and without the senate, by being adlected. Conceivably, other Gallic staff-officers of similar aristocratic backgrounds who had served Caesar well may also have been admitted, men whose names were not mentioned in the Commentaries. If only as many of ten of them were adlected, even into a senate of 600 men, that number might have been sizeable enough to explain the reaction and resentment reported by Suetonius.

How long these men remained in the Senate after Caesar's death is not known. Some (or perhaps all) may have been stricken from the senatorial rolls by Julius' heir, Augustus. As will be seen in Chapter 1, while the influence of Gauls in the Roman army becomes more apparent during the reign of

Augustus, this first Emperor proved to be a far less generous benefactor in the promotion of Gauls than his father, Iulius Caesar, now of blessed memory.

Chapter 1

AUGUSTUS

Introduction

> (Augustus') expression ... was so calm and serene that one of the leading men of the Gauls admitted among his peers that he had been softened and restrained from carrying out what he had intended, namely to push Augustus over the Alps after he had been permitted to approach the Emperor under the pretense of a parlay. 58
>
> (Suet. Aug. 79)

An image commonly portrayed throughout the annals of Roman history is that of an important man surrounded. The superficial picture is the same whether it is a patron accompanied by his clients or Iulius Caesar encircled by his fellow senators. Where the pictures differ, however, lies in the motives of those doing the surrounding. Consequently, in the suspicious world of Roman politics, where an approaching man could be a friend or foe, informer or assassin, there was a constant risk, a daily gamble which important men ran everytime they met someone. For some, the chance for advantage made the risk acceptable. For others, such as Augustus and Tiberius, the risk was at once tedious and nerve-racking; both often found the need to escape from Rome for long periods in order to insure their emotional and physical health.

In this chapter I intend to name or uncover Gauls who "surrounded", that is to say, influenced or even touched on the life of the Augustus and his family and to discuss the extent of power these individuals enjoyed. Before introducing the names of those individuals from Gaul who achieved some prominence or even notice in the Imperial court of Augustus, I shall discuss the relationship he had with Gaul, a fact ascertained by the record of his expeditions to the country, laws enacted which affected Gaul either partly or *in toto* and reported comments which dealt with the region. By explaining the relationship the first Emperor had with the country at large, one can then compare or contrast the relationship he nurtured with individuals from that country. After discussing the relationship Augustus developed with Gaul, I shall in the second section briefly examine the existence of the Gallic community in the city of Rome and suggest reasons why a community flourished there. The third and final section will focus on one segment of that Gallic community, namely the upper class, and discuss those natives of Gaul who became prominent and influential in the Imperial court of that Emperor, either historically or epigraphically. Inasmuch as the evidence permits, I shall describe the backgrounds of these individuals, both those proposed as senators and those of the equestrian class, their means of access to the Imperial court, and the power which they then wielded. When all prominent Gauls have been considered, I shall summarize and then propose an overall reason or even system for the phenomenon of Gallic promotion and influence during Augustus' reign.

Augustus and Gaul

Between the time Julius Caesar left Gaul (49 B.C.) and Augustus assumed sole governance of the Empire (31 B.C.), Gallia Comata was the theatre of a series of civil wars. According to the poet Lucan the tribes of Gaul "rejoiced" (gaudet) at seeing Caesar depart (Phars. 1.420-430). What he meant by this was that instead of establishing the Pax Romana, Caesar's campaign there had merely destroyed enough of the country to upset its delicate, tribal balance of power; that in turn, had plunged Gaul into utter chaos and confusion.

Such was the Gaul which Octavian inherited from his father. His first attempt to quell the disturbances was in 39 B.C., when he dispatched Agrippa to the region of Belgica (CD 49.48.2). There Agrippa initiated the construction of a Roman road-system in Gallia Comata (Strabo 4.6.11), though one would have to conclude, based on the results of his attempts at peace-keeping and the still-disturbed state of the region when he left (i.e., 37 B.C.), that the expedition was not a success. It was perhaps in light of that experience that Octavian, later Augustus elected to carry out any further plans in Gaul by himself. His direct involvement in the affairs of Gaul might also reflect his assessment of the importance of the whole of Gaul within the Empire. Such an opinion was hardly his own personal view. Strategically, Gaul stood as a buffer for Italy against Germanic invasions - Roman memories were still fresh of the Cimbrian and Teutonian wars of 102-100 B.C. (cf. B.G. 1.31)[30]. In addition, Gaul provided both a land-route for goods and materials from mineral-rich Spain and a launching-area for any potential attack against Britain, the latter possibility now thoroughly engrained in Roman heads since Caesar's interrupted expedition there in 55 B.C. Besides the strategic location of the country, Gaul itself offered a wide array of raw materials and what appeared to be an endless supply of auxiliary soldiers. With all these factors, it is not surprising that Augustus made such an effort to secure, organize and Romanize Gaul.

From 29-27 B.C., Augustus, for the first time as Emperor, made frequent visits to the Western provinces of Spain and Gaul. His business in Spain is stated clearly enough, namely to defeat the northern tribes of the Cantabri, Astures and Callaeci which had revolted (CD. 51.20.5). He appears to have remained at Tarragona (Suet., Aug. 26) while his general Statilius Taurus conducted personally the actual war (CD. 51.20.5).

In Gaul itself, so Livy reports, Augustus held court at Narbo and a census was carried out for Gallia Comata (Epit. 134). Up to this time, Narbo had been the capital of all Gaul though it was decided during this trip that the region conquered by Julius Caesar, that is Gallia Comata, should be governed as a separate province, no doubt because of the cultural disparity between the more Romanized south and almost purely Celtic north. Besides these administrative duties and reforms, there was an additional military purpose for Augustus' presence in Gaul. First, Dio says that the Treveri, supported by some Germans, had risen up in Belgica in 29 B.C. only to be subdued by one of Augustus' officers, Nonius Gallus (CD. 51.20,5). In the same year, Gaius Carrinas defeated the Morini and their allies (ibid. 51.21.6). Suetonius adds that in addition to such countries as Pannonia, Cantabria and Rhaetia, Augustus conquered Aquitania (Aug. 21). Some have proposed that this otherwise unknown campaign was intended to punish incursions into Narbonensis by Aquitanian border tribes, such as, perhaps, the Arverni[31].

Augustus' second trip to Gaul, 16 to 13 B.C., was prompted as much by what was termed the continuing confused state of affairs there as by the desire to get away from the overall situation at Rome (CD. 54.19.2). Agrippa had been assigned to Gaul three years before, in 19 B.C., because the Gauls were not only struggling amongst themselves but being harassed by Germans as well. Though he reportedly put an end to those disturbances (CD. 54.11.1), the cessation was only temporary, for in 16 B.C., the army of Marcus Lollius was caught off guard and routed by a plundering band of Sugambri, Usipetes and Tencteri. In addition to that embarrassment, Augustus found the south-eastern border of Gaul (and even of northern Italy) falling prey to Pannonian, Norican and Rhaetian bandits. Initially, Augustus sent P. Silius to reprimand those states (CD. 54.20.1), though they were only soundly defeated after Augustus' stepsons, Drusus and Tiberius, campaigned there from 15-13 B.C.[32]. Drusus, thereafter, directed his energies against the Germans on both sides of the Rhine (Livy, Ep. 139) while his brother Tiberius would later (10 B.C.) attack Dalmatia from his post in Gaul.

It appears that these Roman military successes were accomplished only with the help of auxiliaries from Tres Galliae and Narbonese legionaries. Birley, for instance, lists thirteen alae which either have the word Gallorum as part of their official title or whose recruits are exclusively Gallic[33]; the epigraphical evidence of legionaries stationed in Germany shows a large proportion of recruits from Narbonensis[34]. The irony had arisen, therefore, that if Rome wanted to keep Gaul, it had to use Gauls to do it. It was perhaps out of recognition of Rome's indebtedness to the Gallic auxiliary forces that a number of legal and administrative compromises were made during this trip or shortly thereafter. Of these compromises, the first is mentioned by Dio who says that Augustus bestowed freedom and citizenship on many in Gaul (CD. 54.25,1). It appears that this is the time when certain tribes of Tres Galliae were declared civitates liberae, namely the Arverni, Vellavii, Santoni, Bituriges, Segusiavi, Meldi, Nervii, Suessiones, Leuci and the Treveri (Pliny, HN, 4.14-19). This was a notable distinction, for it not only allowed those tribes to manage their own internal affairs but it also reduced their tribute allotment. Although these tribes were important because of either their numbers or their location, this honour of 'freedom' appears not to have been simply handed to them, but demanded by them. Livy (Epit. 139) writes that an uproar had arisen in 13 B.C. when Drusus, as governor, initiated a census, but that this row was settled soon afterwards. Clearly a number of these tribes, which had dutifully sent forces to support Rome's interests, protested the amount they were ordered to pay. Drusus must have understood that a rising in Gaul at a time of German incursions would have been totally disastrous. Therefore, accommodating the most powerful tribes to insure peace and loyalty was a relatively small price to pay. As a result of these states receiving free-status, the chiefs of the affected tribes who had not already been enfranchised by Iulius Caesar may have been granted citizenship at the same time[35].

The second administrative compromise was the addition of the cult of Roma and Augustus and the concilium Galliarum; both arose partly because of the census but partly also because of another tax-related problem, which greeted Augustus on his arrival in Lugdunum in 16/15 B.C. This problem centered on one individual, a procurator named Licinus, whom Augustus had commissioned to collect revenue. Licinus, whose background will be discussed below (p. 42f.), had been collecting extra monies through extortion and fraud. The chiefs of Gaul, according to Dio (54.21.6), approached

Augustus and made a complaint against his official. Augustus was clearly embarrassed by this situation because he recognized he owed a certain debt to these men for their military support. Despite Licinus' obvious wrongdoing, however, he convinced Augustus that all his actions were done in Rome's best interests. Augustus did not punish Licinus from what we can gather, and in fact, he accepted some of Licinus' ill-gotten gains as a present. Although we know Licinus survived this incident, his fate is uncertain thereafter. He may have been viewed as such a liability and source of potential discontent that he was removed from his position.

Besides these burdens of tribute and administrative corruption, another factor was added to Gaul's list of grievances. Suetonius writes that Augustus forbade any Roman citizen in Gaul from participating in Druidic rites (Claud. 25). This prohibition affected not only the descendants of Roman colonists and the Romanized natives of Narbonensis, but also a large number of Gallic chiefs who had only recently been enfranchised. The reasons why such a decree was made are not stated, though they are obvious. Augustus clearly recognised Druidism as a force capable of unifying Gaul and leading a rebel cry against Rome. Such rites, therefore, seen as diametrically opposed to his policy of Romanization, had to be outlawed[36].

While there are no reports of Gallic reaction to the decree, it is possible to read the establishment of the altar of Rome and Augustus by Drusus in 12 B.C. as an attempt to compensate the primores Galliarum, for their spiritual deprivation. Drusus had summoned these men to the inauguratory festival[37]. Under his auspices, the chiefs chose an Aeduan, C. Iulius Vercondaridubnus, to be the first priest of this cult (Livy, Epit. 139). It was further provided that this gathering of the Chiefs i.e., the concilium Galliarum, would meet each year to select a new priest. Other topics would be discussed as well and it was hoped that the assembly would provide a forum for disgruntled members to air grievances and then have these grievances brought to the Emperor[38]. Whether this actually was the result is debatable. Christopherson argues that the concilium was soon recognised to be merely an instrument of Roman policy not a Gallic assembly with any real power[39]. Nonetheless, it appears to have temporarily calmed the situation enough for Drusus and Tiberius to conduct their campaigns in Germany and Pannonia/Dalmatia without fear of a revolt to their rear in Gaul.

Lastly, it was during his extended stay in Gaul that Augustus is reported to have colonized many cities (CD 54.23.7) and to have made great financial contributions to many other districts (54.25.1). As to the colonies, those which Augustus established or re-enforced are indicated by the word "Augusta" in the official name of the colony. For

Narbonensis, then, these towns include Iulia Augusta Aquae Sextiae, Iulia Augusta Apollinaris Reiorum, and Augusta Nemausus, while in Tres Galliae we can add Augusta Lugdunum, Augusta Raurica and Augusta Treverorum. Many other towns which did not have colonial status also adopted the name Augustus and these may be the ones which Dio says received grants from him. These include in Narbonensis Lucus Augusti and Dea Augusta both of the federated state of the Vocontii, and Augustum (Aouste) of the Allobroges. In Tres Galliae, the towns in question, i.e., Augustodunum, Augustonemetum, Augustomagus, Augustobona, Augustodurum, Augustoritum, are all Latin/Celtic hybrids and all were probably named for Augustus out of gratitude for his support.

We have record of one more stay of Augustus in Gaul, specifically at Lugdunum, in 10-9 B.C. (CD. 54.36.4). At that time, he was more concerned with monitoring the situation in Germany and Pannonia than anything else. All these trips demonstrate how much importance Augustus attached to the security of Gaul, particularly as a factor in the integrity of the whole Empire. By fortifying Gaul's borders and by re-organizing its internal structure, Augustus hoped his policy would both pacify and Romanize Gaul's provinces.

Despite all this attention paid to the development, security and Romanization of Gaul and the allotment of citizenship to many of the chiefs of the country, Augustus' liberality was not without limits. For example, we are told that Livia once tried to convince him to grant citizenship to a certain, nameless Gaul who was a citizen of a tributary state of Tres Galliae (Suet., Aug. 40)[40]. Augustus refused this request, claiming that such enfranchisement would cheapen the privilege of Roman citizenship. Suetonius held that this decision was based on Augustus' ethnocentrism and his desire to maintain the purity of Roman blood[41]. Part of the reason, then, for his rejection of this man's request for citizenship may have been a suspicion not only of foreigners in general, but of Gauls in particular. These people were historically Rome's perennial enemy and despite his accommodation of some of them, he was never able to shake that suspicion off. The story related by Suetonius that one of the primores Galliarum once considered hurling Augustus from a cliff in the Alps was not the sort which would help dispel his prejudices against Gauls (Aug. 79).

Gauls in Rome

Augustus' reaction to the disaster of Varus in A.D. 9, informs us not only about his suspicious attitude toward Gauls but also about the existence of a Gallic community itself. On the point of Varus' terrible defeat, Suetonius speaks in broad terms concerning Augustus' anxiety. He says

> Hac(clade) nuntiata, (Augustus) excubias per urbem indixit ne quis tumultus existeret et praesidibus provinciarum propagavit imperium ut a peritis et assuetis socii continerentur.
>
> (Suet., Aug. 23)

Cassius Dio, however, gives a more pointedly ethnic context to Augustus' dilemma. He writes that at the time of the disaster there were many Gauls and Germans living in Rome. Some, he explains, had settled there while others were serving in the Praetorian Guard. Augustus feared that these men would now take advantage of Rome's crisis and revolt, presumably in Rome itself. To remedy this potential disaster, he re-assigned the Gallic and Germanic guards to some islands while those who were not soldiers were expelled from the city (56.23,4).

Dio's reference to these Gallic praetorians is both interesting and puzzling for a number of reasons. First, it shows that even though these men were chosen for the Guard because of their prowess and loyalty, nevertheless at such a time it became quite apparent how little Augustus trusted them. There was clearly a perception that the Gauls in the Guard, or even perhaps in the auxiliary forces throughout the Empire, were constantly waiting for some disaster to befall Rome so that they then could make a move toward rebellion. Hardly a new attitude, the idea that the Gauls were untrustworthy and ever prone to strike dated back in Roman minds to 390 B.C.[42] The problem is further compounded, however, by the identity of these so-called Gauls. Although, admittedly, the epigraphical evidence cannot often be dated, it appears that all those Gauls who served in the Guard were Romanized natives of Narbonensis. Examples of such men include both Sex. Valerius Firminus (CIL 6, 2549) and L.

Aucilius Secundus (6, 2763) from Vienna, C. Acilius Martialis (6, 2623) from Vasio, and M. Troianius Marcellus (6, 2754) from Lucus Augusti[43]. It would be odd if these were the people or the sort of people whom Augustus feared. Furthermore, Augustus' apprehension that there were enough Gauls in the Guard to pose a real threat is not supported by the inscriptions. Although present, the Gauls were not over-represented to the extent that they formed a majority of the guards. When one considers the fact that the Gauls in the Praetorian Guard were most likely Narbonese and that their numbers there were not overwhelming, it appears there was no real threat but that Augustus in his panic over-reacted.

As to the non-military Gauls in Rome, Dio's comment is the first reference to an actual Gallic community in the capital. While he distinguishes the Gallic praetorians from the "unarmed" inhabitants, many of the latter were, in fact, former soldiers, i.e., ex-praetorians, urban cohorts or legionaries who were living out their retirement in Rome. Although again it is not possible to identify any such individuals during this specific period, evidence from inscriptions at Rome does at least show the existence of such retirees. The text of CIL 6, 3607, for example, records that C. Iulius Silvanus from Vienna served as a speculator (a scout or even an imperial bodyguard) for seventeen years and died, presumably in Rome, at the age of sixty-five. Another Roman inscription from Rome (6, 3639) attests a certain M. Valerius

Saturninus from Forum Julii who fought with the Legio IX Hispana.

There were other civilian Gauls in Rome, though identifying them through epigraphical evidence is not a simple task. A very few inscriptions, for example CIL 6, 20121 which attests C. Iulius Marcellus Narbonesis, indicate the provincial affiliation, though this locational information is rare. Where there is no reference to place of origin, the information can often be gathered from the name of the individual himself. Some Gauls, though adopting Roman nomina kept their native names as cognomina. The names, C. Iulius Capnus (6.19877), Iulius Maricanus (6, 20125), C. Coelius Calenus (6, 39595) and Iulia Elvorix (6, 3593) may belong to this category[44]. There were others who did not adopt Roman nomina but simply Latinized their Celtic names. The nomina of such people as Q. Cottius Rufus and L. Donnius Mansuetus (6, 1396), Bitutius Peregrinus (6, 25681), C. Commagius Secundinus (6, 2741) and T. Roudius Optatus (6, 25494) all appear to fit this pattern[45]. Some names in fact, i.e., Cavarius, Boius, Celtilius and perhaps even Helvitutius and Peturcius, are derived from tribal designations[46]. Most of them are found on tombstones which give very little detail about the lives of these ordinary people, what they did for example, or what brought them to Rome. One can speculate that some came to Rome as, perhaps, sagarii[47] or clients of rich Gauls who had moved to the capital for business or political reasons.

Augustus and the Promotion of Gauls in the Imperial Service

Despite the suspicions Augustus held of Gauls in general whether in Gaul itself or in Rome, he nonetheless, as we have seen, awarded citizenship to many of them in recognition of their importance to the security of the western part of the Empire. In the case of those from Tres Galliae, their promotion was largely restricted to the command of local auxiliary units or to local administrative positions answerable to the provincial governor. It is likely, for instance, that Chumstinctus and Avectius, the tribunes of the Nervii who had fought so bravely for Drusus (Livy *Epit*. 141), were rewarded with citizenship, assuming they were not already enfranchised. Likewise, before C. Iulius Vercondaridubnus became priest of Roma and Augustus, he first probably served in some military capacity and followed that by some local, administrative service.

(T?) Cominius

The opportunities for higher promotion under Augustus were generally restricted, with some exceptions, to natives of the more extensively Romanized Narbonensis. One would presume that these men were considered more trustworthy, perhaps because they were descendants of Italian colonists or were natives of longstanding citizenship. Despite this, however, the number of Narbonese citizens who have been surmised to have reached the senatorial rolls at this time is very small.

Furthermore, the evidence proving that these people were from the Province is not entirely convincing. This is particularly true of a certain T. Cominius who, T.P. Wiseman suggests, was a Roman senator from Narbo toward the end of the Republic or the beginning of the Empire[48]. Wiseman cites the following Roman inscription:

> [...]minius T(iti) f(ilius) Longinus ¦ pr(aetor) ex s(enatus) c(onsulto)
>
> (AE., 1948, 65).

He proposes that the fragmentary name should be read as [T. Co]minius and that the man should be viewed as an ancestor to a "T. Cominius T.f. Po[....]Proculus" (CIL, 6, 2200), a former proconsul of Cyprus sometime under Claudius. By suggesting Po[llia] as this latter man's tribal affiliation, he connects both these T. Cominii with T. Cominius Po[l.], a local magistrate from Narbo (CIL 12, 4389). However ingenious all this might be, Wiseman ignores the fact that the tribe could just as easily be read Po[mptina] or Po[blilia][49]. In general, besides the fact that there are too many wishful restorations and that there is absolutely nothing to connect any of these three men to each other, Wiseman does not mention the possibility that the T. Cominius of Narbo may simply have been a client of the senatorial Italian Cominii[50].

T. and P. Carisius

Wiseman also suggests that a correlation should be drawn between T. Carisius, a monetary triumvir in 46 B.C. and

T. Carisius, (CIL 12, 1028) who is described as a pr. Volcar, which is understood as praetor Volcarum or praetor of the Volcae[51]. Y. Burnand seems sympathetic to this suggestion largely because the combination T. Carisius is rather scarce[52]. He adds further that P. Carisius, one of Augustus' more prominent lieutenants was "frère du précédent (T. Carisius) selon toute probabilité". Publius became the first imperial legate to Hispania Ulterior and in 25 B.C. captured Lancia, the fortress town of the Astures (CD 53.25.8). These same Astures rose again three years later ostensibly because of the cruelty of Carisius (CD 54.5.1). As with T. Cominius, the "fratres Carisii" may have been Narbonese, though it is impossible to say so with certainty since none of the evidence is firmly connected. Wiseman also claims that all three were probably descendants of Roman colonists, a point which again cannot be proven definitively.

Sex. Curvius Silvinus

Sextus Curvius Silvinus is the last in the list of prospective Gallic senators during the reign of Augustus; like P. Carisius, his name emerges in connection with the administration of Spain. The text of an inscription found in Spain reveals that Sex. Curvius, a quaestor pro praetore in Baetica, became patron of the town of Munigua (AE, 1962, 287). Although the inscription itself offers no clue as to its date or Curvius' place of origin, Wiseman suggests he originated from Nemausus and flourished during the reign of Augustus for the following reasons[53]. An inscription found at Rome (CIL 6, 16671) reveals a Sex. Curvius Sex. f. Vol. Tullus. The nomen is very rare and the combination Sex. Curvius almost certainly makes this man the son or at least close relative of Silvinus. Tullus lived during the time of Tiberius and is known best as the parent of the two boys whom the orator Domitius Afer adopted. As Afer was from Nemausus (Hier. Chron. 205) and as Tullus belonged to the Voltinia tribe to which Nemausus (and admittedly most of Gallia Narbonensis)[54] was assigned, Wiseman infers that Silvinus should also be from that town. Burnand is more skeptical, however, saying that the name Curvius is attested only once epigraphically in Narbonensis, i.e., Curvia Urbana, daughter of Scamnus, (CIL 12.4756) at Narbo, but is found (more numerously?) on the Italian peninsula[55]. Burnand himself omits to mention, however, that at Interamna, the town where the name Curvius is most numerous, the assigned tribe is Clustimina, not Voltinia[56]. In addition, the brothers Curvii may have become patrons of the Umbrian town of Fulgentiae though this does not prove their origin from there as the tribal affiliation for that town was Cornelia[57]. As this rare nomen is not found in Spain (with the exception of the aforesaid Sex. Curvius Silvinus) or in Cisalpine Gaul, though it is attested at least once in Narbo, and as Sex. Curvius Tullus of the Voltinia tribe allowed his sons to be adopted by the Nemausan orator

Domitius Afer, it appears more than conceivable that Tullus' home was Narbonensis and that Silvinus, assuming he served under Augustus, is the earliest senator from Gaul whom we can positively identify. As his tribe was the one assigned for native Gauls and not citizen colonists, then he too must have been native, his Celtic nomen perhaps having been Romanized at some previous though unspecifiable time.

Of the names proposed, then, T. Cominius, T. Carisius, P. Carisius and Sex. Curvius Silvinus, the evidence weighs most heavily in favour of naming the last one as a Narbonese senator. The others may also have been Narbonese senators, though the arguments in favour seem to be based on the similarity of relatively common names. Even if all four were from Gaul, that, of course, would represent only a fraction of all senators and none of them, it would seem, had any real influence in Augustus' court. It appears that at this time, any Gauls who enjoyed a greater influence in the court were equestrian procurators.

C. Cornelius Gallus

The most notable procurator during Augustus' reign who is usually considered to have been Narbonese was C. Cornelius Gallus. This knight's political career began after Julius' assassination when he joined Octavian's faction. He fought at Philippi and in 41 B.C. became a triumvir together with Asinius Pollio and Alfenus Varus, in charge of resettling veterans in Cisalpine Gaul. (It was at this time that Vergil, after his property had been confiscated, sought assistance from Gallus, who had been a school-friend and who, in turn, brought the future epic poet to the notice of Augustus.) After Actium, Gallus took charge of Antony's forces in Cyprus and then chased the former commander into Egypt. After Antony committed suicide in 30 B.C., Gallus was instrumental in capturing Cleopatra.

It was in that same year that Augustus, having forbidden senators not only from running Egypt but even setting foot on it, named Gallus as the province's first prefect (CD 51.17.1). Senators were, in Augustus mind and Dio's words, too capable of sedition. In a short time, Gallus initiated campaigns which rivalled those of Julius Caesar himself. He reportedly conquered five Egyptian cities Boreseos, Copti, Ceramices, Diospoleos, and Orphiere, led his army beyond the cataract of the Nile, received the king of Meroe into protection and places a tyrant-king, Triacontaschoeundus, in an area claimed by the kingdom of Meroe. Gallus' main problem with these accomplishments was the way he decided to publish them[58]. Augustus was told that Gallus had set up images of himself throughout Egypt and had even inscribed his accomplishments, his res gestae, on the pyramids. If those actions were not unsettling enough for Augustus, he was also informed by a certain Valerius Largus, described by Dio as Gallus' "friend and intimate", that Gallus had been making disparging remarks about the Emperor. For these acts of *hubris*, and just all-round bad judgement, Augustus forbade Gallus from entering any of the imperial provinces, which in 27 B.C. would have included the province of Narbonensis. With this precedent, the Senate was able to pass its own decree that Gallus should be exiled and his estate confiscated and awarded to Augustus. Before the decree came into effect, Gallus, having been abandoned by everyone, committed suicide.

The extent of Gallus' influence and power would be all the more impressive, if we agree with Syme *et al*. that Gallus was not only provincial but even of native stock[59]. In fact, however, the only proof we have that he was from Gaul derives from Hieronymus who states *Cornelius Gallus Foroiuliensis poeta a quo primum Aegyptum rectam supra diximus, XLIII aetatis suae anno propria se manu interfecit* (*Chron*. 187.3). Syme believes that the adjective Foroiuliensis can only refer to Forum Julii (Frejus) in Narbonensis. Furthermore, he argues, since Forum Iulii *per se* did not yet exist at the time of Gallus' birth (ca. 70 B.C.), Gallus' family must have been native to the area and probably enfranchised by Cn. Cornelius Lentulus, a lieutenant of Pompey[60]. The only other possible corroboration of Gallus'origin comes from Quintilian, who says that the Gallic word *casamo*, which means an attendant, was introduced into Latin by either Labienus, one of Caesar's lieutenants, or by Gallus himself (*Inst*. 1.5.8). One could argue that, while Labienus may have learned that word from his military contact with Gaul, Gallus learned it in his home environment.

There are, however, many problems in accepting Cornelius Gallus as a native Gaul, not least of which is the fact that no contemporary writer, not even one before Hieronymus, even hinted at the idea that he was Narbonese. When one considers how suspicious Augustus seems to have been of foreigners and perhaps of Gauls in particular, it is surprising that he allowed a man of native background to command armies and then rule the new and vital province of Egypt. Furthermore, one wonders why his Gallic birth and Gallica fides did not become an issue after he had effectively been accused of treason. Perhaps the reason why his place of birth did not become an issue was because he was not born in Gaul.

Admittedly, Hieronymus says only that Gallus was Foroiuliensis, not Narbonensis, and it is Syme who has interpreted this to mean the modern area of Frejus[61]. The adjective, however, is not restricted to that one colonia. Pliny (HN 3.19.130), for example, records another town, Foroiulienses cognomine Transpadani, which is the modern Friuli. Although Syme discounts this possibility as Gallus' birthplace, the idea that this town in Cisalpine Gaul was his home correlates better with the few facts we know about Gallus' life. The first fact is his friends. According to the scholiast Pseudo-Probus, he was a friend and condiscipulus of Vergil, who was raised in Cremona. A second friend (actually the one who betrayed him) was Valerius Largus, who has been identified as the Largus who wrote an epic poem concerning the founding of the "other Trojan" city in Italy, Patavium (Ovid, Pont. 4.16.17). He was conceivably, like Vergil, a native of Cisalpine Gaul.

The second fact which points to a Cisalpine birthplace for Gallus is his involvement as a triumvir agris dividendis for that province. It was during this episode that he was forced to intervene to save Vergil's farm. The two other triumviri were Asinius Pollio, who was governor of the province and Alfenus Varus, who was, according to Porphyrio, the scholiast of Horace, a shoemaker from Vergil's town of Cremona (cf. Horace Sat. 1.3.130)[62]. If then both these men had a connection to Cisalpine Gaul, one could argue that Gallus was also appointed to that board because it was his home province.

As a third and final point, Suetonius writes that Augustus raised Gallus up ex infima fortuna, implying that Gallus advanced from the depths of poverty to the height of the equestrian order almost entirely through the beneficence of the Emperor (Suet. Aug. 66). If, however, Gallus had been born a Roman citizen in Narbonese Forum Julii in 70 B.C., it would be hard to understand how he was so poor. At that time, the privilege of citizenship in Gaul was scarce (Tac. Ann. 3.40), the preserve of landowning colonists, businessmen (cf. Cic. Font. 5) and noble local dynasts. While one could argue simply that Suetonius was exaggerating or that the family had struck hard times, a more likely explanation, based on our overall information, would be that Gallus' birthplace was somewhere south of the Po river where Roman citizenship was allotted to everyone, rich and poor, after the Social War. While this does not point specifically to Cisalpine Gaul as his home, it at least tends to weaken the argument for Narbonensis.

While, admittedly, it is impossible to conclude for certain whether or not Gallus was Narbonese, the evidence such as we have, namely that he was initially a relatively poor citizen with contacts in Cisalpine Gaul and with none we know of in Narbonensis, leads one to suppose that he was not a native of Frejus[63]. C. Julian, apparently, was already convinced of that fact, for he nowhere lists Gallus as even possibly a Gallic writer[64].

C. Iulius Licinus

There are other noted Gauls of this first reign, the most notorious being the freedman, Licinus, who was mentioned (above p. 25) as the procurator or revenue-collector of Lugdunum. Details of his life are sketchy, though more certain than those of Gallus. His name, for instance, appears to be Celtic[65] and is attested in such inscriptions as CIL 13, 2733 (Licnos Contextus) found at Augustodunum, CIL 13, 6234 (Licinus Classi F. Helvetius) at Borbetomagus (Worms) and

CIL 12, 4521 (P. Licinius Licinus) at Narbo, where the cognomen appears to be his original Celtic name while his nomen, already widespread in the Province because of L. Licinius Crassus[66], is also formed from the original name. (In some manuscripts, Licinus' name reads Licinius perhaps out of confusion with the more common Roman name.) Dio says that Licinus was originally a slave of Julius Caesar but was freed by the dictator to become his (and later Augustus') freedman (CD. 54.21.3). Hence, when E. Wightman calls him C. Iulius Licinus[67], her reasoning is based not only on the practice of a freedman adopting the first two names of his patron but also the evidence from two inscriptions, namely C. Iulius Licini libertus Tyrrhenus (CIL 6, 20311) found at Rome and ... Iulius Licini libertus Inachus (CIL 12, 4892) found at Narbo[68].

Licinus is always referred to generically as a Gaul (cf. CD. 54.21.2), with no specific claim made as to his tribal origin. Probus states that Licinus was "puer captus in Germania" which could mean that he was a Belgic Gaul, perhaps from the area which was carved up later into the two German provinces. With all this information, it might be possible to date this man's life with reasonable approximation. Caesar made his expedition into Belgica and Germany in 56 B.C. As Licinus was captured as a boy, this would indicate he was not of age for military service, thereby indicating that he was not more than 14 years old. One can estimate the date of his birth, then, at somewhere between 67-70 B.C. Iulius Caesar freed him, so the emancipation must date at or before 44 B.C. In 16 B.C., on Augustus' arrival in Gaul, he was met by chiefs who lodged a formal complaint against Licinus, who, as procurator of Gaul, was extorting excessive taxes from them[69]. How long this situation had been going on is uncertain. Seneca writes that Licinus ruled at Lugdunum "multis annis" (Apoc. 6). As it was Augustus who made him the procurator there, one may suspect that Licinus had been in Lugdunum since 27 B.C. when it became the principal administrative centre for Gallia Comata.

Licinus was held up by later writers not just as a typical bureaucratic rogue but as a typical freedman and typical Gaul. His immense wealth became proverbial, so much so that Juvenal grouped him with Pallas, Claudius' freedman, as an example of the power which imperial freedmen exercised (Sat. 1.109). Although Augustus appeared to be embarrassed by the charges of Licinus' behavior and corruption, at the same time he tried to excuse or deny some of the actions which Licinus was accused of. When he was finally at the point of punishing Licinus (and Licinus himself perceived this), the freedman explained in his own crafty, self-preserving way that all he had done was intended to weaken Augustus' enemies and lessen the possibility of rebellion. To show his sincerity, he then gave much of the acquired loot to the receptive Emperor. Augustus' motives and innocence in this matter become suspect when one views the whole body of evidence here.

One might argue that he appointed a Gaul to the position of tax-collector of the Gauls so that any (inevitable?) abuses would not reflect on the Imperial government so directly; Augustus, obviously did not want a replay of the Fonteius trial (*ca*. 70 B.C.) in which a Roman governor's corruption almost brought Narbonensis to the brink of rebellion. The fact that the Imperial treasury and Augustus himself profitted ultimately from Licinus' misappropriations and that the latter was not punished for his actions tend to support the questioning of Augustus' innocence. One can conclude, then, that although Augustus did not trust Gauls in general and was unreceptive to the idea of placing them in positions of authority, he was, nonetheless, capable of doing just that if the advantages outweighed the disadvantages. Having a Gaul do the unsavoury, though profitable, work of collecting taxes in Tres Galliae apparently outweighed any potential embarrasment or threat to the peace which he might cause. It is not known whether Licinus was removed from office at this time; if he was kept on, he steered clear of any subsequent controversy. He died, according to a scholiast, under Tiberius (thereby surviving both his patrons) and was buried outside Rome.

Celadus

Licinus may not have been the only Gaul in Augustus' extensive *familia*. Another freedman whom Augustus promoted and enriched was a certain Celadus. Named together with

Licinus by Suetonius (Licinum et Celadum aliosque: Aug. 67), he did not, however, achieve the same notoriety and hence what we know of his life is far more shadowy to a modern researcher. To judge from one inscription, he may have served Livia after the death of Augustus[70]. While his origin is totally obscure, E. Evans places the name Celadus among the "Doubtful Names" of Gaul[71]. Although Evans hesitates to draw any conclusion, the fact is that Celadus is found scattered throughout Gaul, possibly as a variant of the ethnic Celtus or Celatus. If, therefore, Licinus definitely was a Gaul and Celadus may have been one, it is possible that some of the alios, that is the other Augustan freedmen who benefitted so much from their master, were also Gallic.

Iccius

Another individual who may have been a Gallic freedman was Iccius, the friend to whom Horace dedicated a poem (Carm. 1.29). The evidence which points to a Gallic origin rests entirely, though solidly, on his name, which is found on six inscriptions from Gallia Narbonensis and one from Belgica[72]. In addition to that, Caesar writes that an Iccius was one of the Roman chiefs who sought an alliance with Rome in 58 B.C.(B.G., 2.3). The name is not found epigraphically outside of Gaul, including Cisalpine Gaul.

As to his career and status, Horace writes that Iccius had participated in Aelius Gallus' expedition to Arabia in 26-

25 B.C. (Carm. 1.29). He adds in Epistles 1.12, that Iccius served as procurator of Agrippa's estate in Sicily. As this type of employment was typical of - though admittedly, not exclusively reserved to - freedmen, it is possible that Iccius, no doubt a Gaul, had once been a slave of Agrippa, possibly captured during Agrippa's campaign in Belgica in 37 B.C. Although it is impossible to prove that Iccius had been like Licinus, a former slave captured in war, nevertheless one can say that this Gaul became a trusted servant of Agrippa, Augustus' son-in-law and a good friend of a poet of the Imperial circle. As such, he must have had relatively easy access to the Imperial court[73].

Iulius Graecinus/Iulius Procillus

Besides the freedmen, a number of free Gauls served during Augustus' time as equestrian procurators. Tacitus relates, for example, that both grandfathers of his father-in-law, Iulius Agricola (born A.D. 40), named Iulius Graecinus (paternal) and Iulius Procillus (maternal), were procuratores Caesarum. From the known date of Agricola's birth, one can estimate the floruit of both grandfathers to have fallen between 20 B.C. and A.D. 20: in which case Caesarum must refer to both Augustus and Tiberius. Presumably they were both from the area of Forum Julii because of their nomen; we can assume they were of native stock, enfranchised either by Julius Caesar or Augustus. As they were procurators of the

Emperor himself, an office which Tacitus calls *equestris nobilitas* (*Agr*. 4.1), their job was to manage the personal property of the Emperor in the region or area where they were stationed. After Augustus died, Tiberius inherited his property and hence Augustus' agents; in Forum Julii this meant that Iulius Graecinus and Iulius Procillus became the agents of Tiberius. As managers, then, their job description approximated more to the duties of Agrippa's agent, Iccius, than those of the provincial procurator, Licinus. As these imperial procurators controlled much of the Emperor's personal wealth and with that, his security, they too wielded considerable influence and had quick access to the Emperor's attention.

There were a number of these personal agents stationed wherever the Emperor had property. One name found at Antipolis (Antibes) which may date to this first reign, is that of M. Iulius Ligus (*CIL* 12, 174), who is described as a *procurator Augusti*. While this may refer to Augustus himself, the inscription cannot be dated with any accuracy and conceivably the Augustus could be anyone from Claudius to Vespasian to Pius[74]. Stein proposes that the Iulius Ligus named here may be the same one referred to in *IGRR* 4.786 where a Iulius Ligus is honoured by the Senate and People of Apamea in Phrygia during the reign of Antoninus Pius[75]

L. Aponius

There were inevitably other procurators in Gaul who managed Imperial finances but whose names have been erased from history. Besides this group, the so-called "equestrian nobility", there is evidence that even during this time a slightly lower class of knights, mostly municipal politicians and military officer personnel, was emerging at a certain level of prominence, even at the level of the Imperial family. Of the four such notables whom we can identify at this time for Narbonensis, the best attested was a certain L.Aponius of Baeterrae, a career officer who seems to be attested historically at the start of the reign of Tiberius (Tac., *Ann*. 1.29) . An inscription dedicated to him (*CIL* 12, 4230) presents some facts appropriate to the time of Augustus. The inscription itself reads:

> *L. Aponio* /// ¦ *praefecto equit(um) tribuno militum*
> *leg(ionis) VII* ¦ *et leg(ionis) XXII praefect(o) castrorum*
> *flamini Aug(usti)* ¦ *primo urbi Iul(iae) Baeter(rensi?)*
> *praefecto pro(duum)viro C(aii) Caesaris Augusti f(ili)*¦
> /// *st.*(?) *Boicnuo patri* ///¦

The text reports that this man, after an impressive military career was honoured as the first flamen of Augustus in Baeterrae[76]. In addition to this, sometime before the death of Gaius Caesar, Augustus' grandson in 4 B.C., he became the *praefectus pro duumvir* for that same Gaius. This fact leads one to conclude that Gaius had become *duumvir* for Baeterrae but that he resigned and was succeeded by L. Aponius. It was apparently a considerable honour to succeed a member of the

Imperial family[77].

What is noteworthy here is that although he is from a Roman colonia and bears a Roman/Italic name, he appears to be a native Gaul. This inference is based on the Celtic name Boicnuus which is found in the inscription and which appears to be the name of Aponius' father. Boicnuus may be derived from two Celtic morphemes, boio-, which is found in the name of the tribe of the Boii, and -cno-, which was a patronymic suffix[78]. As to his nomen, Aponius, which admittedly is more common in Spain than in Narbonensis[79], one can argue that one of his ancestors, perhaps even his father, having been recruited during the civil wars, received citizenship from and adopted the name of Q. Aponius, a Pompeian leader in Spain in 46 B.C. (CD. 43.29). L. Aponius, then, was continuing a family tradition of military service to Rome, similar perhaps to that of the Valerii Caburi (BG. 1.47) of the Helvii and the Pompeii Trogi of the Vocontii. Although the name Aponius is not found again at Baeterrae, there are a number of freedmen named L. Aponius recorded in Narbo[80]. The officer may have moved to the provincial capital, perhaps as a military advisor to the governor.

Sex. Aulienus

A second officer and local official to emerge from Gaul during the time of Augustus was Sex. Aulienus (CIL 10, 4868)[81]. His inscription is found in Venafrum in Samnium, though he is identified as being a native of Forum Julii by virtue of his tribe, i.e., Aniensis, and his completion of the duumvirate both in Venafrum and Forum Julii. For want of any other information, we can assume he was a descendant of Italian colonists and not of native Gallic or Ligurian extraction; his nomen, Aulienus, has the same -enus suffix found in such other Narbonese nomina as Votienus, Lafrenus and Usulenus (see below p. 52), names which are usually indicative of Italo-Etruscan stock. That his chronology dates to the period of Augustus is proven by one of his four stated military prefectures, namely in the office of praefectus castrorum Imperatoris Caesaris Augusti et Tiberi Caesaris Augusti. In other words, he began this prefecture sometime before A.D. 14 and he continued it into the new principate. He probably assumed the duovirate of Venafrum and Forum Julii afterwards. Although Aulienus had a relatively distinguished service record, he is known only through this inscription. This contrasts him with L. Aponius, who presumably is the man noted in the Annals.

L. Aemilius Tutor

The third individual, L. Aemilius Tutor, is identified by an inscription from Geneva, a city of the Allobroges. Tutor's list of offices and honours include quattuorvir iure dicendo, presumably of the oppidum Genava, praefectus fabrum and flamen both of Mars and of Roma and Augustus. The editors of CIL 12 contend that, because the inscription names Augustus, though not the divine Augustus, it must be dated to the period between 27 B.C. - A.D. 14[82]. A certain Lucius Aemilius is found in Caesar's Commentaries (BG. 1.23) described as a praefectus equitum Gallorum; he may have been an ancestor of this local official from Genava.

P. Usulenus Veiento

The final knight of this group from Narbonensis was P. Usulenus Veiento (CIL 12, 4426) of Narbo. Like Aulienus, this individual bears a strikingly Etruscan name and hence should be assumed a descendant of colonists. A duovir, quaestor and flamen at Narbo, Usulenus, appears to have arranged that one of his freedwomen, Usulena (CIL 12, 4892) marry Iulius Inachus, the freedman of Licinus, Augustus' procurator mentioned above (p. 42). It is that evidence which dates Veiento himself to the time of Augustus[83].

C. Iulius Macer

As for Tres Galliae, there has already been discussion of such noted men as Chumstinctus and Avectius, Drusus' tribunes of the Nervii, and C. Iulius Vercondaridubnus, the Aeduan who became first priest of Rome and Augustus at Lyon in 12 B.C. The class out of which these individuals came, i.e., the enfranchised nobiles, supplied scores of other auxiliary unit officers and annual priests at Lyon during the reign of

Augustus, people whose names are largely unknown to us. One man who is identifiable to this period, was a Santonian named C. Iulius Macer (CIL 13, 1041)[84]. According to his rather literary inscription, Macer, the son of a certain Agedillus, served first as a duplicarius in the Ala Atectorigiana, an auxiliary unit recruited by a Gallic chieftain named Atectorix. After thirty-two years with that unit, he was recalled to serve with a Rhaetian division. There he received as honours, a shield, crowns and gold rings from his fellow soldiers.

* * *

None of these people, whether knights or just notables, exercised the same influence that, for example, Licinus or L. Iulius Graecinus did; while some may have brushed the tunic of the Emperor or some member of his family, they had no close contact with or influence at the Imperial court. However, these individuals did have contact with such people as Licinus (cf. Usulenus Veiento's freedwoman, who married Licinus' freedman) or the other procurators or administrators. In other words, through this network of connections, these Gauls just mentioned had an indirect voice and influence over matters which eventually reached the Emperor.

(Cn.?) Pompeius Trogus

One Gaul who attained prominence during this period but whose social rank or personal relation with Augustus, if any, is unknown, was the historian Pompeius Trogus. This man, "la prima voce critica dell'imperialismo Romano"[85] was named above (p. 12) as a Vocontian whose grandfather had been enfranchised by Pompey and whose father had served under Caesar during his campaign in Gaul. Perhaps educated at Massilia (Justin calls him vir priscae eloquentiae[86]), he wrote, besides zoological works which Pliny the Elder sometimes quoted, (HN 11, 229, 274), a world history in Greek beginning with the Empires of the Near East and ending with Augustus in Spain (19 B.C.). Except for the Epitomes of Justin, his works are lost today. It is especially regrettable that we do not have his chapters on Gallic history, as it would be the earliest account of such material actually written by a Gaul.

There are few given details which help in determining Trogus' own life-span. The last datable fact found in the Epitomes is Augustus' victory in Spain in 19 B.C., so the History was obviously composed after that date. The only other comment on Trogus' chronology is found in Matthew Paris, a thirteenth century chronicler and it reads: Anno Divinae incarnationis 9, Pompeius Trogus Caesare Augusto imperii sui 51 annum agente chronica sua terminauit[87]. As it stands, the statement makes very little sense; in Klotz' view it is "wertlos".

If the details of his chronology are scarce, they are copious in comparison to the details of his rank and personal relationship, if any, to Augustus. One can say that, since writing history is rarely the pursuit of paupers, Trogus was in all probability a member of the equestrian order. It is not impossible that he may have been a senator. It was proposed in the first chapter that if Caesar did admit the so-called "semibarbarous" Transalpine Gauls into the Senate, Trogus' father, a trusted, perfectly bilingual staff-officer, would have been a natural choice. The father's rank, then, would have passed on to the son; Trogus, therefore, while not necessarily a member of the Senate would have been considered a member of the senatorial order. All this, of course, though possible, is totally unprovable.

While there is no reference to Trogus personally serving Augustus in an equestrian or senatorial capacity, we can assume that he served Augustus, or at least the Empire in general, by continuing his family tradition in the Roman military, doubtless as an officer. It is likewise true that, while we have no record that he was ever present in Augustus' court, the Emperor must have at least been aware of Trogus and his work, particularly because his World History was up to date and hence had contemporary relevance. We can state, therefore, that while Trogus was probably known to the Emperor at least by reputation, his service or accessibility to the Imperial court is a matter of speculation.

Conclusion

To conclude this account of Gauls in the court and service of Augustus, there are four names proposed as Gallic senators and six as Gallic equestrian prefects or procurators. Of these senators, i.e., T. Cominius, T. and P. Carisius and Sex. Curvius Silvinus, none are assuredly Gallic by birth or origin, though the evidence claiming a Narbonese origin for Curvius is the most convincing of all of them. The fact that another Sex. Curvius, very possibly a relative given the scarcity of the name, belonged to the tribus Voltinia and allowed his sons to be adopted by the Nemausan orator, Domitius Afer, as well as the presence epigraphically of the family name at Narbo (CIL 12, 4756, i.e., Curvia Urbana), makes origin from southern Gaul likely. While he may have been a Gallic senator, there is no proof that Sex. Curvius Silvinus served under Augustus; the Spanish inscription (AE., 1962, 287) which bears his names, dates to the time of either Augustus or Tiberius. As for the others, while the Cominii or Carisii may be of Gallic origin, the evidence is too indecisive for any definite conclusions to be made. Despite the extensive Romanization of southern Gaul, the incipient Romanization in parts of Tres Galliae and the abundant wealth throughout the country, there is no absolute evidence to support the claim that any Gallic senators existed under Augustus.

The evidence for equestrians in the service of Augustus or his family, i.e., C. Iulius Licinus, L. Iulius Graecinus, Iulius Procillus and possibly, C. Cornelius Gallus, (M. Vipsanius?) Iccius, C. Iulius Celadus and M. Iulius Ligus is far more solidly based though it too often rests on possible though unprovable facts[88]. Of all these, Gallus wielded at his peak the greatest authority and influence, enough to threaten the Emperor and shatter their long-time friendship. The question, however, is whether he was born in Forum Julii in Narbonensis and was according to that, a native of that region. The whole body of information, which is not much, seems to lead against that conclusion. Although other equestrians from Forum Julii were on the rise during the time of Augustus, especially L. Iulius Graecinus and Iulius Procillus, there is really nothing in the way of references or connections with the exception of the unspecific, unqualified Foroiuliensis, which says that Gallus was actually from there. In fact, the name Cornelius, although common in other parts of Narbonensis, is not found epigraphically in that city. Even if he was a Gaul (that is one from Narbonensis, not Cisalpina), then his level of authority makes him an exception to Augustus' normal rule of not promoting provincials to positions of power. If he was not a Gaul, then the rule remains virtually unbroken. The only certainly Gallic procurator who reached a high level of authority was Licinus. He, of course, was an exception, chosen for a delicate and unscrupulous assignment in Tres Galliae as much because of his character as his ethnicity.

Augustus' policy of awarding citizenship to leading Gallic nobles and of Romanizing the country through road-systems and town planning was designed to placate the important region. This policy did not include, however, promoting natives of Gaul to positions of prestige. Augustus, like most Italians, was jealous of such positions, most notably the senatorial ones, and felt no necessity for sharing them with his subjects. While Dio says Augustus refused to appoint senators from Egypt (*CD*.51.17.2), one could likewise assert that no effort was made to enrol Gauls either, even natives of Narbonensis. As this was, no doubt, part of his policy of keeping the Roman race "pure" (Suet., *Aug*. 40), the Gauls would have to wait for the reign of Tiberius to receive a share of the *imperium*.

Chapter 2

TIBERIUS

> As Tiberius travelled through Gaul, men cried out: "I was with you, my general, in Armenia"; "I was there with you in Raetia"; I was rewarded by you for my service against the Vindelici"; "I, likewise, in Pannonia"; "I in Germany".
>
> (Vell. Pater 2, 104)

It is possible that the Emperor Tiberius remembered his days in Gaul as the happiest time of his life. In contrast to the conspiracies and rumors of conspiracies which surrounded him as Emperor, his days on the northern frontier, commanding legions which were composed in no small measure of Gallic recruits, were marked in relative terms by steadfast loyalty and gratitude.

It was, no doubt, because of his experience in Gaul and the trust he felt for those he commanded, that we find on the historical records of his reign, the emergence of the first unquestionably Gallic senators, men who even beyond the norm of the rich and powerful, approached the Princeps with relative ease and provided him with indispensible service and support. That fact alone separates the reign of Tiberius from that of his predecessor, the cautious and basically xenophobic Augustus.

Inasmuch as the evidence permits, this second chapter will focus largely on these men, particularly with respect to their means of access to the curia, their accomplishments and connections. First, however, in order to understand better both their rise at this time and the political climate which they entered, the discussion will cover the relations which Tiberius developed with the Gauls in general, before and during his principate. After this topic has been covered, the argument will concern itself first with the senators from Gaul, i.e., both those who are unquestionably Gallic and those who may be so because of historical, linguistic or epigraphical reasons, and then with the equestrians from Gaul, some of whom, as will be seen, later became the parents of senators.

Tiberius and Gaul

Long before the time of Tiberius, branches of his family had been in contact, albeit militarily, with Gauls. Suetonius relates, for instance, how one of Tiberius' adoptive ancestors, a certain Livius Drusus, serving as governor of Cisalpine Gaul (ca. 283 B.C.), returned the gold which had been taken as ransom by the Senones in 390 B.C. (Suet., Tib. 3). (This version countered the tradition that Camillus had restored the ransom.) As an example closer to his own time, Tiberius' father, Tiberius Nero, established citizen-colonies in Narbo and Arelate in 46 B.C. (Tib. 4). Narbo had long been a colony by that time so these colonists simply re-enforced the citizens already there. It was, nonetheless, because of Tiberius Nero's contribution to the development of Narbo that his grandson, Claudius, added the name Claudia to that city's official name.[89]

Tiberius' own contact with the country was far more extensive than any of his ancestors and, for that matter, any of his imperial successors. In his own memoirs as reported by Tacitus (Ann. 1.50), Tiberius claimed that he had been sent to Germany nine times by Augustus and, given the geography of the area, that meant nine times to Gaul as well. We know that he accompanied Augustus there in 16 B.C. and 10 B.C. and that he went alone in 9 B.C., 8 B.C., A.D. 4-6 and 10-11. (In order to account for the nine visits, one has to assume that during the longer expeditions, he was back and forth to Rome at least five times.) Although driving back German or Pannonian forces was his primary concern during these years, he was not able to avoid involvement in internal Gallic affairs since Gaul was his home-base for the other operations. Velleius Paterculus, for instance, reports that Tiberius intervened to settle some heated conflicts which had arisen at Vienna (2, 121.1). As a result of his involvement in municipal or tribal affairs, Tiberius came in contact with Gallic nobiles, just as he did in his military service, given that a sizable percentage of the recruits and officers came from Gallia Narbonensis or Tres Galliae[90]. It was particularly to the latter group, i.e., the soldiers, that Tiberius owed much of his triumphal glory.

Just as historians are ambivalent in their assessment of Tiberius, the Gauls likewise were divided in their opinion of him. For instance, Velleius Paterculus (2,104,3) writes that he had never seen such a spectacle as the crowds congratulating the "old" general as he passed through Italy and Gaul. However much one can dispute the statements made by the pro-Tiberian Paterculus about Tiberius, it seems, to some extent, that what he reports here was true. An inscription found at Bagacum (Bavai) of the Nervii in Belgica (CIL 13.3570) reads:

> *Ti(berio) Caesari Augusti f(ilio)* ¦ *Divi nepoti adventu*
> *eius sacrum* ¦ *Cn.Licinius C.f. Vol. Navos*

This inscription confirms Velleius' account of the enthusiasm which Tiberius inspired in Gaul, particularly in small towns like Bagacum, where a visit by a future Emperor was so remarkable. As Tiberius was adopted by Augustus only in A.D. 4 and as he was not yet Emperor (he never travelled outside Italy after his accession), this visit dates somewhere between A.D. 4-11.[91]

It was during that same time frame that those Gauls named Tiberius Iulius received Roman citizenship[92]. In Velleius' account of Tiberius' triumphal ride (2,104,4), he says the soldiers cried out to him: *Ego tecum, imperator, in Armenia, ego in Rhaetia fui, ego a te in Vindelicis, ego in Pannonia, ego in Germania donatus sum*. Those named Tiberius Iulius, both Tiberian veterans and their descendants, are found mostly in Belgica and Aquitania, no doubt primary areas for recruitment for the German army.

The dedication to Tiberius at Bagacum was not an unusual or extraordinary monument. Hatt writes "Tibère est de tous les empereurs celui auquel les Gaulois ont consacré le plus de monuments et d'inscriptions", and then proceeds to name some of them throughout Tres Galliae[93]. Rivet says that in Vintium (Vence) in the Maritime Alps, among the dedicatory inscriptions to Emperors, there were ones for Tiberius, Elagabalus, Gordian III, the two Philips, Decius and Valerian[94]. In other words, Tiberius was not only the only one of the Julio-Claudians so honoured but was the only one for the first two hundred years of imperial rule.

On the other hand, despite the examples of loyalty to him, Tiberius had enemies in the country as well. Suetonius relates that while Tiberius was in exile at Rhodes, citizens of Nemausus overturned the statues of him (Tib. 12). They did this out of annoyance at the reports that he was adopting Greek habits. Nemausus, although a tribal centre of the Arecomici, was already very Romanized and very proud of the fact (Strabo 4.1.12). Perhaps a greater reason for the contempt toward Tiberius was not so much his own unpopularity as the popularity of Drusus, Germanicus, and Gaius Caesar, all of whom were immensely well-liked in Gaul. Gallic recruits and officers had served under those three as they did under Tiberius but unlike Tiberius, these men, who were less inward and more outgoing, seemed to approximate more closely the general ideal of what an imperator should be (Tac., Ann. 1.33). Tiberius was recognised as a good general tactically though he lacked the qualities of compassion or comradeship which apparently Drusus had. While Germanicus was seen as the successor to Drusus' good qualities and virtues (Tac., Ann. 1.33), Tiberius was remembered as the one who never took initiative on military grievances but waited instead for Augustus' decision (Tac., Ann. 1.26 and cf. Suet. Tib. 19). Although Tiberius' procedure was the normal one to take, the soldiers had seen a different and more agreeable approach in the methods of Drusus and Germanicus. So, if the soldiers and, in particular, the Gauls loved Tiberius less, it was because they loved Drusus and Germanicus more.

The resentment toward Tiberius by some Gauls is made evident by their involvement in rebellions against him during his reign. The first two came almost simultaneously in A.D. 14 and were prompted essentially by Tiberius' accession. The first of these took place in the Pannonian army which Tiberius had once commanded and whose conscripts were in fair measure Gallic. The leaders of the rebellion chose the time when Tiberius had just been made Emperor because they thought that, as he was still not firmly in control, he would be more agreeable to their demands; more importantly, they knew there would be no concessions without a show of force (Tac., Ann. 1.17). Tiberius' son, Drusus, was sent to address the Pannonian troops who, by now, had seized their commander, Q. Junius Blaesus, and his staff and household. After much wrangling, confusion and violence, the soldiers finally requested Drusus to ask his father's kindness both in improving their conditions and in pardoning them for the revolt. Drusus then chose as a delegation to the Emperor, the son of Blaesus the governor, a knight named L. Aponius, who was on Drusus' own staff, and a centurion of the first order, Catonius Iustus. Of these three, the latter two appear to have been Gauls. The first, L. Aponius, was the knight who was discussed in Chapter 1 (above p. 48). He had a distinguished service record long before he was chosen by Drusus as a delegate to the Emperor himself. We have seen that Aponius was appointed praefectus pro duovir of Baeterrae in place of Gaius Caesar, an office which must have been held before or in A.D. 4, and was named first flamen of Augustus in that same urbs. In his military career, he was posted, according to Pflaum[95], in the Balkans (specifically Moesia) with the seventh legion and in Egypt with the twenty-second; he served as tribune in both legions and was further promoted in Egypt to prefect of the camp. This final rank was, in Parker's words, "a sort of glorified quartermaster", one who worked not with just one legion but almost as a liaison between legions, insuring that operations and equipment were in order during war and peacetime.[96] While sometimes the duty of praefectus castrorum was given as a promotion to a centurion, it was also the case that tribunes, like Vespasian's father (and, of course, L. Aponius) were promoted to this rank.[97] It was no doubt because of Aponius' record of performance and experience in liaison that he was chosen for this delegation. He will be discussed again later in this chapter (below p. 102).

Far less can be said about Catonius Iustus, the centurio primi ordinis, at least during that period in time[98]. Because of his rank, one might conclude that he had already served for no less than fifteen years; it was for that reason, i.e., first hand experience, that he was chosen to speak to the Emperor about army conditions and tenure of service. Although his name looks Roman on the surface, Catonius is, in fact, Gallic and appears to be a variant of such other names as Catonus and Catunius[99]. Epigraphically, the name is largely centered in Belgica and even examples found outside of that area can probably be traced back to there.[100] It is possible then that these two men, L. Aponius and Catonius Iustus, were chosen not only because of their loyalty and long-time service, qualities which the Emperor would have appreciated, but also because of their ethnic background, something to which at least the Gallic recruits of the Pannonian army could relate[101].

Tacitus claims that the army of Lower Germany revolted at roughly the same time and for the same reasons as the Pannonian legions (Tac. Ann. 1.31). In contrast to the Pannonian legion, however, the Germanic army had an additional cause for revolt, namely, the installation of Germanicus, Augustus' blood relative and their own commander-in-chief. As

Drusus had been sent to quell the rebels in Pannonia, so Germanicus, appropriately, was sent to Lower Germany.

Epigraphical evidence shows that a sizable percentage of the Lower German army, like that of Upper Germany, was composed of conscripts from the whole of Gaul. The names of Narbonese recruits from Nemausus, Alba Helvorum, Lucus Augusti, and Baeterrae together with Biturigians of the _ala Longiniana_ and Belgic auxiliaries, are all found on inscriptions at the camps of Vetera, Bonna and Colonia Agrippinensium and perhaps one can say in greater proportion than soldiers from other areas.[102] The natural question to arise from this information is whether or not the Gallic troops were part of the rebellion and, if so, did they rise as Gauls with interests different from Rome and the other soldiers? For want of any such comment by Tacitus, our principal source for this event, such a question is hard to answer. It can be said, however, that in trying to win the rebels to his side, Tacitus makes Germanicus stress the fact that Italy and Gaul were remaining faithful to the new emperor (Tac. _Ann._ 1.34). There was talk of pitting auxiliaries against the legionaries which would have meant among other things, that Narbonese soldiers would fight against recruits from Tres Galliae. Among the points which Germanicus used finally to win back the legions was the fear that Belgic auxiliaries would earn a great deal of glory by coming to Rome's help (Tac., _Ann._ 1.43). This fear, so well employed by

Germanicus, exposes the internal rivalries that existed in Gaul, ones which would become most evident in A.D. 68-69.

The third western rebellion against Tiberius was instigated in 16 by Clemens, a former slave of Agrippa Postumus, who hoped to avenge his master's murder. His initial plan had been to rescue Agrippa Postumus from Planasia and lead him to the supportive armies of Germany (Tac., Ann. 2.39) but after this was scuttled by Agrippa's murder, he tried a second approach, namely to impersonate his master. Dio says then that Clemens, who did resemble Agrippa somewhat, went to Gaul, where he gained some following as a pretender and then marched on to Rome, picking up supporters on the way (CD. 57.16.3-4). Some of Tiberius' agents finally caught him off guard and, arresting him, brought him before Tiberius. Although Tiberius was unable to extract any information from Clemens on his contacts or confederates at Rome, Tacitus reported, somewhat unspecifically, that the rebel had received support not only from knights and senators but even from "many" within the Emperor's domus (Ann. 2.40). (The choice of this term, domus, is regrettable because of its ambiguity. Used metonymically, the word can mean household attendants or slaves, which would make sense when one considers Clemens' station. It can also mean, however, family in the narrow sense, an interpretation which is again not inconceivable, given Tiberius' unpopularity with the Julian side of the Imperial family.) It was no doubt with Clemens' supporters in mind that Tiberius executed him in secret and disposed of his body in like stealth. For want of any further comment about Clemens' army, one has to assume that it disbanded itself after its leader disappeared.

Although all three of these rebellions against Tiberius involved Gallic recruits, it was only the one in A.D. 21 which can truly be called a Gallic rebellion. According to Tacitus, our only source for the event, the Gauls rebelled because of "the continuation of the tribute, the burden of interest and the cruelty and arrogance of the Imperial legates" (Tac. Ann. 3.40). Other reasons have been suggested as well. First Suetonius, who makes no reference to the rebellion at all, says that Tiberius had confiscated the property of leading Gauls (among others) on the grounds that they were holding their money for rebellious designs (Tib. 49). Because Suetonius does not date the time when Tiberius did this, it is not possible to determine whether this added to the frustration which led to the rebellion or if it was done as a punitive action after the rebellion had been put down. Second, the elder Pliny (HN 30.13) writes that Tiberius outlawed Druidism not only for Roman citizens in Gaul but for everyone there. This suppression, it has been suggested,[103] "exasperated the feeling" of frustration caused by the harsh economic policies. Once again, no date is given for that edict and, while A.D. 16, the year the mathematici and magi were expelled from Italy, might correlate conveniently with the ban on Gallic rites, one cannot tell for certain whether the ban helped instigate the revolt, was the result of the revolt, or even if the two points were at all connected.

Five tribes in Tres Galliae actually took part in the rebellion, namely the Andecavi, Turoni, Sequani, Aedui and Treveri (Tacitus reports that a rumour circulating in Rome had forty-six "states" involved), and although the Aedui and Treveri were powerful in number, the divisions within the tribes over the idea of rebellion and the absence of any effective coordination of the part of the various rebel leaders made their defeat inevitable. Consequently Tacitus reports that Tiberius was able to write to the senate in a single message that the rebellion had begun and was quashed (_Ann_. 3.47).

Three Gallic names which emerge in Tacitus' narrative have considerable relevance to the discussion of service under and acquaintance with the Emperor. The first two are those of rebel leaders, Iulius Florus of the Treveri and Iulius Sacrovir of the Aedui. Tacitus writes of these two: _Nobilitas ambobus et maiorum bona facta, eoque Romana civitas olim data, cum id rarum nec nisi virtuti pretium esset_ (_Ann_. 3.40). One assumes, therefore, that these men, born to the local aristocracy, were the sons or grandsons of knights who had served Caesar or Augustus and had received Roman citizenship for their efforts. Each man was, no doubt, like the German rebel, Arminius (Vell. Pat. 2.118.2), a citizen of the equestrian order. Iulius Florus, for example, must have been fairly renowned even before this rebellion, as Tacitus writes that it was he who was assigned to bring together other Belgic Gauls against Rome. He had most likely been a prefect of an auxiliary cavalry unit. It is impossible to determine whether he was related to a later Iulius Florus who taught rhetoric in Gaul (Quint., Inst. 10.3.13) and was the uncle of another Gallic orator, Iulius Secundus.

Tacitus presents more detailed information about Sacrovir (Ann. 3.41). He says that, when the rebellion first broke out among the relatively insignificant Andecavi and Turoni, Sacrovir fought with the Romans. He kept his head uncovered, in his words, to show off his bravery (ostendendae, ut ferebat, virtutis); in the testimony of the defeated captives, however, Sacrovir kept his head uncovered to ensure that the Gauls would know it was he and not kill him. The implication here is that these tribes had presumably set up an arrangement with Sacrovir to ambush the Romans, though he, inexplicably, fell back on their agreement. When this version of the battle against the Andecavi and Turoni was related to Tiberius, he rejected it outright, thereby, in Tacitus' words, encouraging the war further. What this further implies is that Tiberius seems to have been fairly well-acquainted with Sacrovir and did not believe him capable of rebelling against the Empire. A reasonable assumption here might be that Sacrovir had served as a lieutenant to Tiberius during his operations in Gaul and Germany and had shown no signs of any disloyalty. Although Tiberius must have been pleased by the outcome of the uprising, he must have been equally disturbed by the fact that someone he had trusted had betrayed him[104]. This may explain in part why he became so paranoid about treason in the second half of his reign.

The third name to emerge in this contest in Iulius Indus, a nobleman of the Treveri[105]. While Iulius Florus was the standard-bearer of the anti-Roman faction in Treveran politics, Iulius Indus, on the other hand, was the leader of the pro-Roman side. According to Tacitus, Indus fought against Florus cum delecta manu and this band is usually interpreted as the original ala Indiana, a Gallic auxiliary unit which apparently bears his name[106]. He defeated Florus in a single battle, and the rebel leader was forced to commit suicide.

It is tempting to speculate how Tiberius would have rewarded Indus for his loyalty and success. This Gaul had probably served, like Sacrovir, alongside Tiberius while he was in Gaul. As he was already both a citizen and perhaps an equestrian and since a place in the senate was not yet a practice for a Gaul from Tres Galliae, the most likely reward would have been a portion of the property confiscated from Florus because of his treason. While we know of no offices or other services conducted by Indus, it appears his son-in-law, C. Iulius Alpinus Classicianus, became procurator of Britain in A.D. 61 (Tac. Ann. 14.38)[107]. This demonstratess not only how the family of Indus maintained its importance but also how Rome rewarded consistent and effective loyalty.

The Gallic rebellion of A.D. 21 and the probable Gallic participation both in the revolts of the Pannonian/Germanic legions and in the one of Clemens, the slave of Agrippa Postumus, demonstrated, on the one hand, how volatile and wavering the Gauls were in their loyalty to Rome; on the other hand, however, one can equally argue that, while some Gauls revolted, they were usually appeased or defeated by other Gauls who remained, for some reason or other, loyal to Rome. L. Aponius became the mediator between the aggrieved soldiers of the Pannonian army and the powers in Rome which regulated their conditions. There were Gauls present on the Roman side against the Andecavi and the Turoni (most notably Sacrovir) while a rebellious squadron of Treveran cavalry was routed by a pro-Roman Treveran contingent. When Sacrovir began his rebellion, he first took as hostages the sons of the most noble families of Gaul who were studying at Augustodunum. Obviously, he suspected most of the noble families had pro-Roman sympathies and would be inclined to fight against him on such an issue as revolution. Tiberius must have realized that, just as he owed much to the Gauls who served him while he was heir to the throne, so too he now owed rewards and concessions to those who helped support him as Emperor. From this point, therefore, the discussion will introduce, examine and perhaps uncover men from the four provinces of Gaul whom Tiberius rewarded with either senatorial or equestrian honours. The first group to be discussed will be those senators who were definitely from Gaul and this will be followed by a detailed list of others who may have been senators from that area. After the senators, the discussion will review the notable Gallic equestrians who were part of the rather broad circle of the Emperor.

The Senators

D. Valerius Asiaticus

Of the three men whom we can positively identify as Gallic (i.e., Narbonese) senators under Tiberius, D. Valerius Asiaticus, Cn. Domitius Afer and L. Iulius Graecinus, the one who reached the highest level of influence and authority was Valerius Asiaticus. This man was born in Vienna, the capital of the Allobroges, a fact both noted by Tacitus (*Ann*.9.1) and alluded to in the famous speech of Claudius which is recorded on a bronze tablet in Lugdunum (*CIL* 13,1668). That he was probably of a native aristocratic family is supported by the fact that he had powerful connections throughout Gaul (Tac., *Ann*. 9.1), and strong ties with members of the imperial family. The inference that he was a native Gaul and not the descendant of Italian colonists is further supported by the fact that when he was born, somewhere between 15 and 5 B.C., Vienna was an Allobrogian tribal centre without Roman colonial status; it acquired that honour, it seems, during the reign of Caligula[108]. It is likely that his family had been Roman citizens well before Vienna received full rights[109]. Furthermore, it is possible that his family, like that of C. Valerius Caburus (Caes., B.G. 1.47), may have been enfranchised as far back as 82 B.C., when C. Valerius Flaccus rewarded those Gauls who had rendered him military support in his Spanish campaign.

In a speech to Claudius by the father of the Emperor Vitellius, it was remarked how Valerius Asiaticus was as devoted to Antonia Minor, Claudius' mother, as Vitellius himself. This of course, implies a special relationship between Asiaticus and Antonia[110], one which can be explained in one of two possible ways. The first is that he had served with and befriended Germanicus, Antonia's son, during his campaigns in Germany and thereby enjoyed the hospitality of Germanicus' family at Rome. That might also explain why be became so intimate with Caligula, Germanicus' son (Sen. Cons. 18.2). On the other hand, friendship with Germanicus became a dangerous liaison during the time of Sejanus (cf. Ann. 4.68), so a second explanation for Asiaticus' connection with Antonia might have been through the mediation of Drusus, her husband and Tiberius' brother. Perhaps Asiaticus' father, conceivably a powerful Allobrogian chieftain, had become a lieutenant and confident of Drusus and both families, thereupon, became guests of the other. If so, Asiaticus would have stayed with Drusus' family when he visited Rome.

His contact with the imperial family made his entrance into Roman society relatively easy. On this basis of two inscriptions, namely one dedicated to his grandson whose name was M. Lollius Paullinus Valerius Asiaticus Saturninus (CIL. 14,4240) and the other to a certain Lollia Saturnina (CIL. 6,21473), it has been suggested that Asiaticus married this Saturnina, whose grand- father, M. Lollius, had once served as commander of the Legion V Alaudae. Saturnina's sister, Lollia Paulina, later became the wife of Caligula, thereby making the friends Asiaticus and Caligula brothers-in-law.

On the basis of an inscription published in 1947, it appears that Asiaticus became consul in A.D. 35, thereby becoming the first positively identifiable native of Gallia Narbonensis to have reached that position. We know nothing of his cursus before that though we can assume, if he went through even a semblance of the normal sequence of offices, that he first became a senator in the early to mid-20's. He did have a younger brother who also became a senator and who appears even to have reached the consulship sometime between 36 and 46 A.D.[111]. Nothing else about this man, however, (i.e., his full name, career, private life) is known to us today.

Cn. Domitius Afer

The second most important senator from Gaul during this reign was Cn. Domitius Afer who, Hieronymus says, was born in Nemausus (*Chron*. 205.4). Although Hieronymus is the only source we have for this point, his credibility is not in question as he is so often supported in other texts and references. For example, he says that Votienus Montanus was from Narbo (*Chron*. 201.3) and this is confirmed by Martial (8.7.5).

Although the name Cn. Domitius was found scattered in southern Gaul, because of the military exploits of Domitius Ahenobarbus in 120 B.C., there is no proof that Afer was a native dynast, like Asiaticus. No mention is made of any military service or broad connections in Gaul. His expertise was, to our knowledge, restricted to civil matters and his fame derived almost exclusively from his oratorical skills.

Afer came to prominence in A.D. 25 when he became praetor at Rome. Where he was before this is totally unknown. He may have been a local magistrate from Nemausus who had been noticed by Tiberius and adlected to the Roman senate; on the other hand he may just as easily have already been settled in Rome, pleading as an advocate in the Forum. The year after he served his praetorship, Afer, whom Tacitus, in contrast to the wealth and connections of Asiaticus, describes as *modicus dignationis et quoque facinore properus clarescere* (*Ann.* 4.52), prosecuted Claudia Pulchra, a cousin of Agrippina the Elder, on the charge of witchcraft and adultery. He did this at the behest of Tiberius (perhaps Sejanus as well), who regarded Afer, a relatively poor though ambitious character, as a useful tool in legally ridding himself of his enemies and family rivals. Whereas other advocates in Rome had ties to senatorial families and hence would be inclined to shy away from involving themselves in the delicate matters of factional rivalry within the Imperial family, Afer was a complete outsider whose only motive, it appears, was the favour of the Emperor alone.

In the following year, A.D. 27, Afer initiated another successful prosecution, this time against Claudia Pulchra's son, Quintilius Varus (Tac. Ann. 4.66). Tacitus explains that this prosecution surprised no one, since Afer, having been poor for a long time and having wasted his recent earnings, was now in dire need to make more money. The historian seems to contrast Afer with his prosecuting associate, P. Cornelius Dolabella, a patrician who was actually related to Varus. Although both had completely diverse backgrounds, they were both similar enough in their ability to do anything for profit.

It is surprising that, while Afer earned a hated reputation because of these trials, the exposure of his skills also earned for him the highest accolades of the oratorical critics. Quintilian, for instance, who heard him in Rome as a young boy, considered Afer to be summus orator (Inst. 12.11.3) and labelled him with another later Gallic orator Iulius Africanus as "praestantissimi" (ibid. 10.1.118). In listing the best qualities of Rome's most outstanding orators, Quintilian says that Afer was noted for his maturitas, a word variously translated though which could possibly mean "perfection"[112] (ibid. 12.10.11). Afer wrote two books on oratory which Quintilian had read.

Of his wife or natural children, nothing is recorded. He did however, adopt the two sons of a certain individual, Sex. Curvius Tullus (Pliny Ep. 8.18), whose name came up in the discussion of Sex. Curvius Silvinus a possible senator under Augustus (see above p. 35). It is because of the relationship with Afer and the fact that Sex. Curvius Tullus belonged to the Voltinia tribe (CIL 6,16671), that many scholars have proposed that the senatorial Curvii were also Narbonese, claiming either Narbo or Nemausus as their home[113]. The two young men, Lucanus and Tullus, were, even after they had been adopted by Afer, known as the brothers Curvii.

L. Iulius Graecinus

While Asiaticus was powerful for his connections and Afer had notoriety because of his oratorical skills, neither of them appears to have been as respected as L. Iulius Graecinus, a senator under Tiberius from Forum Julii. His father, also perhaps of the same name, was mentioned above (p. 47) as having been a procurator of the Caesars (that is, both Augustus and Tiberius) in that same colony. It was as a result of this connection, one would assume, that the younger

Graecinus came to the notice of Tiberius. He studied, possibly in Rome, under a noted teacher Cornelius Celsus (Columella. 1.1.14) and later married Iulia Procilla, the daughter of a procurator from Intimilium (see above p. 47) which is not far from Forum Julii.

Like Afer, Graecinus was a lawyer by profession and Tacitus adds that he was noted for his interest in *eloquentia* (rhetoric) and *sapientia* (philosophy) (*Agr*. 4). Columella quotes extensively from a work on vineyards, which Graecinus wrote, in his own *De Re Rustica*. It seems likely that it was because of Graecinus' interest in agriculture that his son was given the name Agricola.

Whereas Tacitus simply comments that Graecinus belonged to the senatorial order (*Agr*. 4), Seneca specifically states that Graecinus reached the level of *praetor* (*De ben*. 2.21.5). In this passage, Seneca says that when Graecinus became praetor, two men of notorious life, Paullus Fabius Persicus and C. Caninius Rebilus, offered to defray the costs of the games he was supposed to put on, an offer which he rejected. Obviously, Graecinus suspected that by accepting their gift, he would be under obligation to those men.

His praetorship is confirmed further by an inscription (*AE*. 1946, 94). The text reads that Graecinus first became tribune of the plebs and thereafter took the office of praetor. The inscription also reveals that L. Graecinus had a brother, M. Graecinus, who was also a senator and had reached the office of quaestor[114]. It is unclear whether this M. Graecinus, who is never mentioned historically, served under Tiberius or if he entered the curia later, for example, under Caligula. Given his obscurity, he probably had very little influence outside Forum Julii.

There were, therefore, three men, D. Valerius Asiaticus, Cn. Domitius Afer and L. Iulius Graecinus, who, we can say for certain, became senators under Tiberius. Two of these men, Asiaticus and Graecinus, had brothers who may have been senators later, though details are too scanty to make a firm conclusion as to the time. Of the three which can be agreed on, Afer and Graecinus both reached the rank of praetor during the reign of Tiberius while Asiaticus received the enviable award of consulship in A.D. 35. In fact, Asiaticus became consul despite the fact that his home-city, Vienna, had not by that time acquired full Roman rights. This break in normal constitutional practice seems to indicate that even by that time Asiaticus wielded a significant level of authority and influence.

P. Memmius Regulus

For historical, epigraphical and linguistic reasons, it is possible to suggest that as many as ten other men may have served under Tiberius as senators from Narbonese Gaul. Of these possible Gallic senators, there are two who became consuls during Tiberius' reign, the first of whom was P.

Memmius Regulus. Regulus became consul suffectus in A.D. 31, a year eventful for the conspiracy and fall of Sejanus. It is ironic that his colleague, Fulcinius Trio, a friend of Sejanus, actually accused Regulus of being slow in suppressing Sejanus' supporters (Tac., Ann. 5.11). Given the chaotic state of the senate at that time, such a comment amounted almost to a charge of maiestas. The fact that Regulus survived the purge which followed indicates the Emperor trusted him and did not take the charge seriously. Tiberius, no doubt, recognised the fact that Trio, whether guilty of complicity with Sejanus or not, went on the offensive immediately so as to deflect any suspicion from himself[115]. Four years after this episode, in A.D. 35, Regulus became legate of the imperial provinces of Moesia, Achaia and Macedonia, a post he continued with until the year 44. That Regulus may have been of Narbonese origin is suggested by the dedication of a statue and inscription to him in the town of Ruscino (Roussillon), about forty-five kilometers from Narbo, which identifies him as their patron (ILG 633). No mention is made, however, whether he ever served a public office in that town. One possible interpretation of this evidence is that he was a local son who had "made good" and became a patron of the town, just as the Younger Pliny did at Comum. Memmius, admittedly, is not a common name in that province though it is found scattered there[116]. Furthermore, we know he was not a member of the prominent Roman plebeian Memmii because Tacitus writes that his own notability (generis claritudo) was recent (Tac., Ann. 14.47).

A second clue to a possible Narbonese origin for Regulus is that he was for a very brief time married to Lollia Paulina who was, as already stated, the sister of Lollia Saturnina, whose husband was the Vienna-born Valerius Asiaticus[117]. These women were the granddaughters of M. Lollius, the ill-starred commander of the Legion V Alaudae, who in 19 B.C. lost the eagle of the legion to some marauding Germans. (The defeat was not comparable to the one of Varus twenty-seven years later. Of Lollius' defeat, Suetonius writes that it was maioris infamiae quam detrimenti whereas that of Varus was exitiabilis [Aug. 23].) Because one of Lollius' daughters married a man who was definitely a Gaul and the other married a man who may have been (all at a time when arranged marriages were the custom), it is tempting to speculate that while Lollius was governor of Gaul, he cemented enduring and profitable friendships with many of the native leaders. Each side had something the other wanted. For Lollius, the native dynasts in their rich province had what appeared to be an endless supply of money and resources. For the Gauls, whether native or colonist, Lollius, even as a novus homo, offered the prospect of access to Roman aristocracy and the seat of world power.

There is, however, evidence, namely Memmius' tribal affiliation, which casts some doubt on his alleged Narbonese origin. According to an inscription published fairly recently[118], C. Memmius Regulus, the son of Publius, belonged to the tribus Galeria. The difficulty here with Galeria is that citizens of Gallia Narbonensis were not assigned to that tribe; it was, rather, the tribe assigned to colonists in a number of places in Spain and at Lugdunum[119], both of which bordered on and had many business-related dealings with Gallia Narbonenis.

There is not enough information on Memmius' background to establish whether he came from Spain, Lugdunum or, for that matter, from another town altogether. The idea that Spain was his home is, perhaps, the most cogent possibility if only because the name Memmius is not uncommon there[120] and because the country by that time had already produced consular men[121]. Lugdunum, although unlikely, cannot be totally disregarded as his patria either. As a full Roman colony separate from Tres Galliae[122], its citizens already had the right to seek offices in Rome. Furthermore, the name Memmius is attested four times epigraphically in Lugdunum which is more than in any other individual town west of Italy with the exception of Sabora in Baetica[123]. If indeed Regulus was from Lugdunum, it would mean not only that a Lugdunum native reached the consulship before anyone from Narbonensis but that the two Lollian sisters, Paulina and Saturnina, married men from rival cities, that is, Lugdunum and Vienna.

While tribal affiliation can be a help in pinpointing origin, it is not always so. The *tribus Galeria* could indicate Spain, Lugdunum or even Genua in Italy but without further information it is difficult to decide on one or another. Sometimes in fact, the tribal affiliation of an individual conflicts with the normal one of his home-town. A good example of this is the Viennese T. Pompeius Albinus (*CIL* 12,2327), whose tribe was not the expected *Voltinia* but rather the *Tromentina*. The only thing one can conclude from all this evidence, then, is that a person's tribe can often narrow down the place of his birth, though the process is not so scientific as to operate infallibly. In other words, there is no conclusive evidence to say that P. Memmius Regulus was (or was not) from Gallia Narbonensis.

M. Porcius Cato

The second possible Gallic consul was M. Porcius Cato, a man who is first mentioned historically as an informer. In A.D. 27, this Cato, together with Lucanius Latiaris, Petilius Rufus and M. Opsius jointly accused a Roman knight, Titius Sabinus, of defaming Tiberius (Tac. *Ann*. 4.68 f). The informers, all of whom had held the office of praetor and were desirous of reaching the consulship, had entrapped and framed Sabinus because he had been a friend of Germanicus; his conviction would, in turn, curry favour with Sejanus, who was the best means of access to the consulship at that time

(4.68). Although Tacitus foretold the doom awaiting all four informers (Ann. 4.71)[124], Cato, nevertheless, alone among them was able to reach his goal of consulship beforehand in A.D. 36.

Little has been written of Cato's origin. Despite his rather famous name, it seems doubtful that he was related to the long-ennobled Porcii Catones[125]. Certainly, if he were, Tacitus would have commented that a relative of the Catones had abandoned all principle to win rewards from a tyrant. Possibly, his origin rests in Narbo. An inscription from that city (CIL 12,4407) identifies a M. Porcius Cato as duumvir, together with a certain Vettius Rufus, in the year A.D. 36. It is more than tempting to suggest that this Narbonese duumvir and this politically active Roman senator of the same name were in fact the same individual. If they were the same, then M. Porcius Cato performed his office of Narbonese duumvir in the same year that he became Roman consul. To put this another way, Cato began the year as duumvir at Narbo but resigned it later in the year to become consul suffectus.

As for his name, while there is absolutely nothing Gallic about M. Porcius Cato, the name does have a double relevance in Narbo. In the first place, when the colony of Narbo was established in 118 B.C., a M. Porcius Cato was one of the consuls for that year (Eutropius 4, 23). Secondly, there is some, though by no means convincing, evidence that a M. Porcius Cato had been governor of Gaul in the 90's B.C.[126].

Conceivably, then, our M. Porcius Cato may have been a native of the province whose ancestor had adopted that name for one of those reasons.

Among the possible Gauls who only reached the praetorship under Tiberius, are Cn. Domitius Corbulo, Q. Marius Celsus and Curtius Rufus. The evidence that all these men originated from Narbonensis ranges from the doubtful to the compelling but it falls short of being totally conclusive.

Cn. Domitius Corbulo

In the case of Cn. Domitius Corbulo (not the famous general but presumably his father), there is both historical and linguistic evidence to suggest origin from Gallia Narbonensis. First, the name Cn. Domitius suggests a connection with that province because of the exploits there of Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus in the 120's B.C. and the continued clientele which the noble family maintained in the region. Second, we know he was not of the noble Domitii, if for no other reason than the peculiarity of his cognomen. Corbulo was not used by the Roman Domitii. More to that point is the important circumstance, that the cognomen Corbulo seems to be a Celtic name. Syme agrees that it may be Celtic (and by specification Gallic) and lists two instances where the cognomen is found in Gaul, the first (CIL. 12.2414) at Augustum of the Allobroges (CIL 12,2414), the other at Salodurum among the Helvetii (CIL 12.5718)[127]. The name is also found twice, however, in Central Italy, once at Cupra Maritima (CIL. 9.5329) in Picenum and once at Alba Fucens (9.6349)[128]. Regrettably, as none of these names can be dated, it is impossible to say whether these individuals chose the enigmatic name Corbulo because it meant something to them personally or if it was chosen out of respect for the famous general. Syme seems to conclude, from the fact the family had property in the town of Peltuinum in east-central Italy, that Cn. Domitius Corbulo was a senator of municipal Italian extraction[129]. He admits, however, that owning property in a place does not necessarily mean origin from there.

The discussion of the origin of the Corbulones has so far touched only on the possible Celticity of their name. A review, however, of its base Corb- and suffix -ulo(n) makes that possibility far more credible. The base corb- appears to be derived ultimately from the Celtic name Corobus (CIL 13,4307), of which Crobus (13,3778) and Corbus (CIL 3,920) appear to be variant forms. From these basic forms, there developed, with the employment of other Celtic suffixes, other names, such as Corobilius (CIL 13,3992), Corobilla (13,1139), Corbilla (13,2001)[130] and Crobula[131]. The best way to connect the name Corbulo to these names is by comparing the development of other Celtic names[132]. For the name Cotus (13,4366), there are extended forms such as Cottalus (13,4366) who was, in fact, Cotus' son, and Cotulo(n) (CIL 12,5686). Presumably from the base vindo-[133], we find developments such as Vindulus[134] and Vindulo(n) (12,3198), while from the hypothetical name Sappus, there are Sappius (12,3872-3), Sappossa (13,3045), Sappula (13,3990) and Sappulo(n) (13.3743)[135].

One can argue, therefore, that Corbulo appears to be Celtic in formation. One can further specify that since the name is not found in such other Celtic regions as Cisalpine Gaul or Spain, it is specifically a Gallic name. In Gallia Narbonensis, the name is found only once epigraphically and that inscription is found in the territory of the Allobroges. It is possible, but by no means certain, that Cn. Domitius Corbulo also came from that area, the same country which Valerius Asiaticus called home. If the name Corbulo is connected to the Irish word corb which means chariot[136], then the family of the Corbulones probably had military connections and were part of the native aristocracy, like Asiaticus.

Tacitus relates an episode about this older Corbulo which may have a definite relevance here. He writes (Ann. 3.31), that in A.D. 21, Corbulo, who had already performed the office of praetor, complained in the Senate that a young nobilis, L. Sulla, had refused to give him his seat at a gladiatorial show (Tac., Ann. 3.31). The debate which followed this was described as magnum certamen, pitting the supporters and relatives of the well-connected, patrician Sulla against normal Roman tradition of respect for senatorial seniority. Eventually Drusus, Tiberius' son and the consul for the year, was able to calm what had become a most inflamed issue and Mamercus Scaurus, the uncle and stepfather of L. Sulla and a leader in the Senate, apologized to Corbulo.

What Tacitus refrains from mentioning, perhaps because it was self-evident to his readers, was the motive for Sulla's disrespectful behaviour. One could conceivably propose that Sulla, a descendant of Rome's once powerful patrician class, considered himself far superior to a senator who was not only of provincial birth but even of Gallic ancestry. The whole episode perhaps demonstrates how the established order in Rome, as represented by the old Republican families, viewed and resented the rising new order which was composed of rich municipal Italians, Gauls and Spaniards with close ties with the military. The fact that the previously unheard-of Corbulo won a point of order over the ancestrally-illustrious Sulla, seems to show that their resentment and suspicion of this apparent policy which curbed the privileges and dignitas of the old families but which promoted them for the new was, to a great extent, justified. No less justified, however, were Tiberius' own reasons for such a policy: simply put, he trusted his own appointees more than he trusted the old noble families who were a constant threat, if not to his security, at least to his state of mind.

Corbulo married Vistilia, whose father (or perhaps brother) was an ex-praetor who had been a close friend of Drusus, Tiberius' brother (Tac. Ann. 6.9). Of Italian origin, Vistilia's claim to fame was not just that she was the mother of the famous general, Corbulo, but that she had been married six times (Pliny, NH. 7.39) and that among her other children were Suillius Rufus, a notorious prosecutor under Claudius, and Milonia Caesonia, the last wife of Caligula. In other words these and other siblings were the relatives whom the younger Corbulo could later call upon.

Q. Marius Celsus

The second name in this list of possible Gallic praetors, Q. Marius Celsus, is not found in any historical reference but on a single inscription (Inscr. It. 13.1, p. 299) which records that he was praetor peregrinus for A.D. 31. This man is usually judged both to have been the father of A. Marius Celsus, who was the consul for 62 and 69, and to have been perhaps the son of C. Marius Celsus (CIL 12,3252), who was a quattuorvir for Nemausus under the early Empire. Burnand, however, is hesitant to accept that Q. Marius Celsus was a native of Gallia Narbonensis because, in his opinion, the names Marius and Celsus are both too diffuse, too common, to connect one Marius Celsus to another[137]. Strangely enough, however, while both the nomen and cognomen are common, the combination of both names is itself not only rare but almost the exclusive preserve of that family.

If, therefore, Q. Marius Celsus was the son of C. Marius

Celsus, the quattuorvir (iure dicundo?) of Nemausus, then his mother would have been Pompeia, the daughter of Pompeius Toutodovix (CIL 12,3252), who was doubtless the descendant of one of Pompey's enfranchised Gallic conscripts. The name Celsus was fairly common in Gaul[138] and while it may have been adopted there because of its positive and "lofty" connotations, it may also have been used as simply a Latinization of the Gallic name Celtus (cf. Vindex from Vindus).

Q. Curtius Rufus

The evidence that Curtius Rufus, who reached the praetorship at Tiberius' own intercession, was from Gaul is, like that of Marius Celsus, somewhat compelling though at the same time not entirely convincing. One problem for modern researchers trying to determine his origin is that even the ancients were unsure. Tacitus, for example, does not record his origin though he is suspicious about the rumour that Rufus' father had been a gladiator. Bypassing Rufus' roots, then, Tacitus reports that Rufus, after he came of age, joined the entourage of the quaestor for Africa (Tac. Ann. 11,21). Later, he went to Rome and for such stated reasons as the largitio amicorum et acre ingenium (Curtii ipsius), he was elected consul under Claudius. Obviously, Tacitus has left out the most important details of Curtius' rise to the senate, not least of which was the identity of his rich and generous friends. Tacitus continues by saying Tiberius recommended Curtius for the praetorship and on learning of his *dedecus natalium*, the Emperor simply replied, *Curtius Rufus videtur mihi ex se natus* (Tac. *Ann*. 11,21).

A connection is usually drawn between this Curtius Rufus and the Quintus Curtius Rufus who wrote a history of Alexander the Great under Claudius, though scholars are not sure whether they are the same man or perhaps father and son[139]. The evidence on which some suspect the praetor under Tiberius was originally from Gaul is found in an inscription (*AE*, 1986, 475) found at Orange, which reads:

> *s(inistra) d(ecumanum) I u(ltra) k(ardinem) XXII*¦
> *col(oniae) iug(era) XCVII S*=, ¦ *insul(ae)*
> *Furian(ae)*, ¦ *Q(uinto) Curtio Rufo* ¦ *(duum)vir(o) et*
> *invent(ore) nova iug(era) XV S=-*, ¦ *pr(aestant) a(era) III*
> *(denar) III S =- TAI* ¦ *sol(vunt)* [h(eredes) Fi]*rmi* ¦
> [Secundi].

The text, which seems to record a land-sale, is dated to the first half of the first century A.D. and identifies a certain Q. Curtius Rufus as a *duumvir*, presumably of the colony of Arausio. While Burnand is sceptical of connecting Curtius the praetor with Curtius the *duumvir* of Orange (he calls it a "rencontre onomastique")[140], nonetheless, one can argue that both men had identical names, were contemporaries and men of business (*Ann*. 11,21). If these two individuals were, in fact, one man, and Orange was his home, then it would be plausible that the *amici* at Rome who helped him reach the quaestorship were also Narbonese. The idea that his origin was only uncovered by Tiberius after he had become praetor may show how influential these friends were and how entrenched their network of support already had become. The circumstance of someone of unsuitable background reaching so lofty a position is reminiscent of Valerius Asiaticus' ascent to the consulship in A.D. 35. Because of his birth at Vienna, which was not a full Roman colony, he was officially ineligible at that time for the consulship, a point about which Claudius would later complain bitterly (cf. CIL 13, 1668).

Sex. Curvius Silvinus

Among the other possible Narbonese senators who either did not reach the level of praetor or whose senatorial rank is not recorded, one, Sex. Curvius Silvinus, appears to have been a quaestor at Rome before becoming a quaestor in Spain. Silvinus was mentioned as having possibly been a senator under Augustus, though it is also conceivable he did not serve until the time of Tiberius. It is likewise unclear what his relationship was to Sex. Curvius Tullus, who was of the Voltinia tribe and whose sons, Tullus and Lucanus, Domitius Afer adopted, though, when one considers the rarity of the combination Sex. Curvius, they probably were father and son or brothers. While there is no proof that Sex. Curvius Tullus was a senator, he was fairly wealthy (cf. Pliny, Ep. 8.18) and if Silvinus was his father, that would automatically enrol him in the senatorial order.

Abudius Ruso

Abudius Ruso is another individual who has been proposed as a Narbonese senator[141]. This man, an ex-aedile who had commanded a legion in Upper Germany, is reported, after the fall of Sejanus, to have tried to prosecute Lentulus Gaeticulus, then the governor of Upper Germany, because he had promised his daughter to Sejanus' son. In such a confused time, the case ironically resulted in Abudius being condemned and expelled from the city (Tac., Ann. 6,30).

In reference to the origin of Abudius, Syme notes that the senator's name looks Celtic though he falls short of saying specifically Gallic; in fact, he says possibly Transpadane. Nevertheless, while some evidence might point to Cisalpine Gaul as the patria of Abudius, there is other evidence to claim Gallia Narbonensis as his home, in particular, his rare nomen.

The name itself bears an ending -udius (or perhaps -budius)[142], which is reminiscent of such Celtic names as Velludius (CIL 12,20), (which is a variant of the purer form Velloudius (CIL 12,3288), where the diphthong has not been levelled), and Budius (var. of Boudius)[143]. Geographically it is restricted largely to Cisalpine and Narbonese Gaul[144]. In Cisalpine Gaul, the five instances of the name are found exclusively on the north-eastern coast of the Adriatic. These examples include two from the Colonia Iulia Parentium (Parenzo, Porec): T. Abudius Verus (CIL 5,328), who was at some unspecified time sub-prefect of the fleet at Ravenna, and P. Abudius Verus (5,329); one from Udine: P. Abudius Rusiculenus (5,8110, 34); possibly one at Pola: (A)budia Publia (5,216) and the last at Aquileia, a certain M. Abudius Verus (5,8323), who may have a connection to the freedmen Abudii of Rome[145]. In Narbonese Gaul, two inscriptions bearing the name Abudius were found at Vasio, the twin-capital (with Lucus Augusti) of the federated state of the Vocontii, L. Abudius L.F. (CIL 12,1388) and Q. Abudius Frontonis L. Theodotus (12,1303). Nothing in this evidence points more toward Cisalpine Gaul than toward Narbonensis but when one considers the relative scarcity of the name, it is conceivable that all Abudii, Cisalpine and Narbonese, may have been related, though that still does not answer the relevant question of where Abudius Ruso originated.

Just as is the case with Abudius' nomen, an investigation of his cognomen alone offers no conclusive evidence for his place of origin. Ruso, some have argued, is a Celtic name[146] and it is, like Abudius, restricted to northern Italy and Gaul. A variant spelling of the derived form Rusonianus, namely Rousonianus, (CIL. 13.2281), perhaps implies the original spelling of Ruso was Rouso. This latter form looks far less Latinate than Ruso and it is possible that the spelling was altered to look more acceptable in Roman society. Although found in Cisalpine Gaul, the only other prominent Rusones of this approximate period, besides Abudius, were C.

Calvisius Ruso (cons. for 54) and M. Licinius Ruso (*CIL* 12,2443) of Aquae Sextiae who was either the consul for A.D. 112 or a relative of the consul. Both of these men were, arguably, Narbonese[147].

Further to this point of Abudius' cognomen *Ruso*, we know from Tacitus that Abudius Ruso was legate of a legion in Upper Germany though the historian omits mentioning which one (Tac., *Ann*. 6,30). An inscription from Upper Germany may be relevant here. The inscription reads as follows:

> 1. *Adbogius Coi¦nagi f(ilius) na(tione) Petr¦ucorius*
> *eq(ues) alae ¦ Rusonis an(no) ¦ XXIIX sti(pendio)*
> *X ¦ hic situs est ¦ ex testamen¦to libertus ¦ fecit*.
> (*CIL* 13,7031 Mainz)

The text reveals an otherwise unattested *ala Rusonis* or the cavalry unit of Ruso. The identity of this Ruso, who no doubt raised the division cannot be determined exactly though it would not be unlikely since the *eques* Adbogius was a Gaul from the Petrocorian tribe, that Ruso was also Gallic, perhaps specifically from the nobility. Although Romans sometimes raised cavalry units in Gaul (cf. C. Silius and the *ala Siliana*), there was likewise an equally well-documented tradition of Gallic nobles raising up auxiliary units to support Rome; two of the best known examples are the *ala Atectorigiana* and the *ala Indiana*, established respectively by Atectorix and Iulius Indus[148].

Since the inscription appears to be dated to the first century A.D.[149], and since Abudius Ruso is the only man with that uncommon cognomen whom we can identify as having served in Upper Germany during that century, then it may be possible to suggest that he and the Gallic nobleman who raised the ala Rusonis were the same individual. As a Gaul, Ruso would most likely have originated from the Vocontian tribe whose territory is the only area where his rare nomen, Abudius, is recorded. The idea that he may have come from this civitas is hardly surprising. The Vocontii had a long history of support for Rome (cf. Cic., Fam. 10.23.2) and there was already in place another better known cavalry unit which originated there, the ala Vocontiorum. Abudius Ruso, therefore, like Valerius Asiaticus, may have first been appointed to the exclusive assembly of the Senate because of his military connections in Gaul and the political ones which naturally follow. He was expelled from that same senate and the very city of Rome at a time when Tiberius was judging more strictly those same military and political connections.

Togonius Gallus

The reference to another senator who is conceivably Narbonese, Togonius Gallus, is found only in Tacitus (Ann. 6,2). Tacitus tells what amounts to almost a funny story about him immediately after the fall of Sejanus. At that time, Tacitus writes, when so many nobles were vying for Tiberius' favour, Togonius Gallus "inserted his own ignobility among the great names" and suggested that the Emperor chose twenty armed senators to protect him (Tiberius) whensoever (quotiens) he entered the senate. Tiberius, perhaps rather than embarrassing Togonius outright, sidestepped the request saying that if some were chosen, others would be jealous. Furthermore, the Emperor added _Quam deinde speciem fore sumentium in limine curiae gladios?_ The idea of armed men in the senate was foreign to Roman custom and, assuming Togonius simply was not thinking when he made the suggestion, one might conclude that he was not aware of that custom because he himself was, in the eyes of many Romans, foreign.

The name Togonius, even more convincingly than Abudius, is Celtic in form, the first syllable, tog- , possibly being related to Irish _toig_ which means pleasant or agreeable[150]. Although one might expect to find names with this morpheme throughout the whole Celtic world, there are no such examples in Cisalpine Gaul and only one in Spain (_CIL_ 2,5469), Togus-, which is fragmentary[151]. In the whole of Gaul, however, there are a number of names recorded which contain the morpheme tog- such as Togius (_CIL_ 12,1257; 12,3960), Togiacus (_CIL_ 12,4641), Togenetus (_CIL_ 13,3321), Togimarus (_CIL_ 13,1395) and Togirix (_CIL_ 13,5055)[152]. The _-onius_ suffix which follows the morpheme _Tog-_ of Togonius is also a common ending in Gallic names (cf. Excingonius, Sattonius, etc.). All this evidence, i.e., 1) Togonius' "ignobility", 2) the evidence for his nomen,and perhaps even his cognomen, seems to point to a provincial and specifically Gallic origin for this senator. The fact that Togonius survived the post-Sejanian purges and that Tiberius seems to have handled his very unorthodox request with kid-gloves, could mean that Tiberius trusted the man and, presumably, even liked him.

In conclusion to this review of Gallic senators under Tiberius, one is struck by the number of new senators, both Gallic and possibly Gallic, serving the new regime. Whereas under Augustus, there are no definitely proven Gallic senators and only four possible ones (i.e., T. Cominius, P. and T. Carisius and Sex. Curvius Silvinus) under Tiberius there are three who were definitely senators, D. Valerius Asiaticus, Cn. Domitius Afer and L. Iulius Graecinus and twelve who may have been, namely P. Memmius Regulus, M. Porcius Cato, Cn. Domitius Corbulo, Q. Marius Celsus, Curtius Rufus, Abudius Ruso, Togonius Gallus, Sex. Curvius Tullus (and possibly Sex. Curvius Silvinus, his father (?), Valerius Asiaticus (the brother of Decimus) and M. Iulius Graecinus (the brother of Lucius). Though all these individuals came from different backgrounds, it is possible, nonetheless, to make some broad overall observations and conclusions which relate to a number of them. First of all, the great majority of them bore names which were indistinguishable from the names of native Romans. Presumably, adopting such names was the bare prerequisite for Gauls ambitious of promotion in Roman society. Even the men whose names were exceptions to this rule, i.e., Corbulo, Ruso and Togonius, adapted their names to look less Gallic (cf. Rouso) and hence perhaps less suspicious.

For these men, entry into the Senate was by two basic avenues, i.e., the military and the public service, both local and imperial. As to the military, while all of them served in the army, individuals like Valerius Asiaticus or Abudius Ruso actually owed their prestige to their military connections in Gaul. The rest owed their prominence to the practise of law and public administration. With such prominent lawyers arising out of Gaul at this time, Domitius Afer, L. Iulius Graecinus and the yet-to-be discussed Votienus Montanus, one has to suppose that the schools in Gaul, perhaps specifically at Massilia, must have been among the Empire's finest.

The historians Tacitus, Dio and Suetonius, to list the most important ones, make no direct comment on the attitude of old Roman senators to the new, Romanized, Gallic ones. Some subtle clues do emerge, however, which expose a certain resentment to the newcomers. Valerius Asiaticus appears to have raised some eyebrows when he first reached the consulship in A.D. 35, though no one dared complain about him until he was condemned thirteen years later. Their jealousy was increased when he became consul for the second time (Tac. Ann. 9,1), a feat which was, admittedly, rare but by no means unheard of[153]. The story of Domitius Corbulo's verbal affray with the young L. Sulla may be argued as a classic example of how the old Roman aristocracy resented not perhaps the presence of Gauls in the Senate but rather their increasing power. The fact that Corbulo won an apology from Sulla's stepfather implies that Rome wanted to keep its Gallic senators appeased. Lastly, the reference to Togonius Gallus "inserting his ignobility among such great names as the Silani and the Scipiones" corroborates the conclusion that Romans did not object to the actual presence of Gauls in the Senate but they did resent their not knowing their place. As with Corbulo, however, Togonius was treated respectfully by the Emperor. So, just as the advances by the Gauls to the senatorial class were impressive under Tiberius, no less so were those of the prominent equites.

Gallic Equestrians

L. Aponius

Some of the prominent knights under Tiberius have already been discussed above (pp. 48,65). L. Aponius, for example, the military liaison between the Roman governor, Iunius Blaesus, and the Pannonian legions in A.D. 14, took part in a delegation to Tiberius in that same year to discuss the causes of the rebellion. The son, presumably, of a native Gaul named (L. Aponius ?) Boicnuus, came from Baeterrae and had, in addition to his military career, served in such local capacities as praefectus pro-duovir and flamen Aug(usti). He once served as praefectus pro-duovir for C. Caesar, the adopted son of Augustus and later served under Drusus, the son of Tiberius. When one considers his service record, therefore, it is not surprising that he was chosen to discuss the grievances of the Pannonian troops with the Emperor.

L. Aponius was both a prominent local official from an important coastal Roman colony and a military hero with contacts as far up as the Imperial family itself. These qualities were part of the requisite background which generally brought men into the senate and hence the question arises whether Aponius himself was adlected under Tiberius. Although Tacitus refers to Aponius as an eques Romanus in A.D. 14, it is also true that a number of freedmen of L. Aponius are found both in Rome and Narbo[154]. If the patron L. Aponius was the same man, this may indicate that he had residences in both places, a fact which, while not proof of senatorial rank, nonetheless implies a substantial wealth and importance. Although it is impossible to conclude for certain that Aponius became a senator, (the only statement we can rely on, states he was not: Tac,. Ann. 1,29), he appears to be the father of M. Aponius Saturninus who emerged as a praetor in the reign of Caligula (Jos., AJ 19,264)[155].

Votienus Montanus

A second name which has already been mentioned is that of Votienus Montanus, the famous orator from Narbo. Unlike Domitius Afer, for whose origin at Nemausus Hieronymus is our only source, there are a number of references which prove Narbo was the patria of Votienus. Martial, for example, in writing about Narbo, calls it docti Narbo Paterna Votieni

(8.72.5). These points are further confirmed by an inscription from Narbo (CIL 12,5258) which identifies a certain L. Votienus L.l. Pudens. The nomen Votienus is not found elsewhere in Gaul.

On the basis of his rare, peculiar nomen, Syme infers that Votienus was a descendant of Italian colonists[156]; that, of course, distinguishes him from other Narbonese notables who were of native Gallic (or Ligurian) extraction. Other than the fact that he had a friend named Marcius Marcellus (who may or may not have been from Narbo), we have no information on his personal life or background. One assumes the well-known advocate was a knight, since no further reference exists saying he was a senator.

The elder Seneca reports a case in which P. Vinicius rogatus ab colonia Narbonensi, prosecuted Votienus in front of Tiberius himself (Controv. 7.5.11). Although Seneca does not say what the charge was, it must have been relatively serious if the Emperor presided. As to the date of the trial, some have assumed it was the same trial against Votienus which took place in A.D. 25[157] (Tac., Ann. 4,42). There, he was condemned for making disparaging remarks about the Emperor and thereupon sent into exile on the Balearic islands (Hier., Chron. 201.3). The trial reported by Seneca, however, and the one mentioned by Tacitus, at which, admittedly, Tiberius also presided, appear not to be the same since Seneca says that Votienus was much amused by P. Vinicius' oratorical skills and later used some of Vinicius' choice expressions in his own speeches. This would seem to imply that after the trial he continued to practice rhetoric and law as usual, which hardly fits the situation of someone condemned to exile.

It is likely then that there were two trials against Votienus presided over by Tiberius (one before A.D. 25 and the other in A.D. 25) and it would not be an unreasonable assumption to propose that Tiberius had a grudge against the famous lawyer. Perhaps, unlike Domitius Afer or Porcius Cato, Votienus was a Narbonese lawyer who had refused to prosecute individuals whom Tiberius wanted removed. That sort of refusal would be seen as a bad precedent for the Emperor's network of informers and hence Votienus himself would have been viewed as a serious security risk. Apparently, however, the Roman authorities were content simply to neutralize Votienus and not have him executed. Despite his conviction on the serious charge of _maiestas_, he was only exiled. According to Hieronymus (_Chron_. 201.3), he died on the Balearic islands in A.D. 27, two years later.

Iulius Africanus

Votienus was not the only Gallic-born knight who in some way, threatened or at least incurred the suspicions of Tiberius. The most obvious threats were the rebel leaders Iulius Florus and Iulius Sacrovir, though both of them fell to Tiberius' forces with relative ease. In another case, ten years after that brief rebellious episode, at least one Gaul was implicated in the conspiracy of Sejanus. Tacitus alone records the fact that Iulius Africanus of the Santones was condemned together with an ex-praetor Q. Servaeus and an equestrian Minucius Thermus for involvement in the scheme (Tac. Ann. 6,7). This Africanus is not found elsewhere in historical sources and it is possible he was only named[158] because he was the father of orator Iulius Africanus who came into prominence during the reign of Nero (Quint., Inst. 8.5.15)[159]. If so, the elder Africanus must have been both wealthy and influential, the type of person whom the conspirators would have solicited for support. It is conceivable that he joined the plot as a reaction to Tiberius' attempts to confiscate property from wealthy Gauls (Suet., Tib. 49).

Iulius Marinus; Iulius Celsus

Two other Julii, perhaps Gallic, met their downfall because of their associations with Sejanus. The first of these, Iulius Marinus, had once been a friend of Tiberius, having stayed with him at Capri and Rhodes, though he was condemned because previously he had joined with Sejanus in crushing a certain Curtius Atticus (Tac., Ann. 6,10). Syme suggests that this Marinus might be the same as C. Iulius Marinus[160], another Santonian like Iulius Africanus, of the Santoni who is noted on two inscriptions, namely CIL 13,1048 and 1074. Syme concedes, however, that Marinus might likewise be connected to a later Ti. Iulius Marinus who came from Berytus (mod. Beirut). The second man, Iulius Celsus, a tribune of the urban cohort, may again be Gallic by virtue of his name (Tac., *Ann*. 6,10). Having once served as a juryman on the trials of some noble Romans who had been implicated in the plot, he was eventually arrested himself. After he had been put in chains, Celsus was able to loosen his bonds just enough so that he was able to break his own neck (Tac. *Ann*. 6,14). Although suicide is no proof of Gallic origin, the account of Celsus' painful self-immolation does present a certain brutal courage, a trait for which the Celts and other barbarians admittedly were noted.

Iulius Montanus

A final Iulius connected to Tiberius (this one not at all a participant in the conspiracy of Sejanus, or anyone else for that matter) was a poet named Iulius Montanus. Once again it is his name which arouses suspicion of Gallic origin. Both nomen and cognomen are found frequently in Gaul and the cognomen is especially common in Aquitania[161], the home, among other tribes, of the Santones. The elder Seneca (7.1.27) describes Montanus as *comes (Tiberii)*, *egregius poeta* (*Controv*. 7.1.27), while the younger Seneca refers to him as *tolerabilis poeta et amicitia Tiberi notus et frigore* (*Epp*. 122.11). The use of *comes* is an interesting choice for, while it has the basic meaning of one who accompanies, it can also refer specifically to a comrade, i.e., someone you fight alongside[162]. This notion recalls the many battles Tiberius and his brother fought with their Gallic supporters, among whom were such people as Valerius Asiaticus (or his father) and perhaps Iulius Sacrovir. The fact that he became a close friend of Tiberius, despite possibly being a Gaul, is not surprising. Tiberius had been a misfit in his own class and his friends from that group were scarce. It was more typical of Tiberius to absorb into his circle outsiders either as friends or, more importantly, informers[163].

On a final note, the possibility that Montanus was a Gaul would not exclude his being a "tolerable" poet. By this time, Gallia Narbonensis had produced such writers as the poet Varro Atacinus (and maybe Cornelius Gallus), the philosopher Fabius Maximus and the historian Pompeius Trogus. In addition to these writers, Domitius Afer and Iulius Graecinus had both written technical treatises, the former on oratory, the latter on botany.

Sex. Afranius Burrus

A Gallic knight who began his career under Tiberius and who eventually reached the height of equestrian power was Sex. Afranius Burrus. Burrus originated, perhaps like Abudius Ruso, from the state of the Vocontii, specifically from its capital city, Vasio. His father (or at least some close relative) is identified in an inscription there as the patron of a freedman named Euneos (*CIL*. 12.1309). A far more important local inscription deals with Burrus himself and reveals the basic facts of Burrus' life and career. The inscription reads as follows:

> *Vasiens(es) Voc(ontii)* ¦ *patrono* ¦ *Sex(to) Afranio*
> *Sex(ti) f(ilio)*¦ *Volt(inia) Burro* ¦ *trib(uno)*
> *mil(itum) proc(uratori) Augus*¦*tae proc(uratori) Ti(beri)*
> *Caesar(is)*¦*proc(uratori) Divi Claudi* ¦ *praef(ecto)*
> *praetori ornamentis consular(ibus)*
> (*CIL* 12,5842)

The information one first gathers is that Burrus was the son of Sex. Afranius and a member of the Voltinia tribe, to which most citizens in Gallia Narbonensis belonged. It has been suggested that his Roman name Afranius was acquired by an ancestor who had served under L. Afranius, one of Pompey's lieutenants in Spain[164]. In this way, his family received citizenship and their name in the same way that the family of L. Aponius of Baeterrae (above p. 102) did. As to his cognomen, while *Burrus*, meaning 'red', is found in Gaul, it is not as common as *Reburrus* which means "with bristling hair". Possibly, Burrus altered his name when he moved to Rome since the reference to his hair may have conjured up notions of the long-haired Gaul (cf. Gallia Comata) among his more urbane associates. Although the inscription mentions that he had served as a *tribunus militum*, it does not specify where or in which legion he was posted. Tacitus comments that Burrus was a man *egregiae militiae famae* (*Ann*. 12,42,1), a description which assumes he had seen action in some trouble-spot (like

Germany or the East) and had received high commendation for it. Perhaps as a reward, he was transferred to the Praetorian Guard. That posting would explain the series of events whereby he came in contact with the Imperial family, became one of their most trusted agents and eventually took over as praefect of the Emperor's own Praetorian Guard.

As his first recorded non-military position, he became procurator, that is manager, of Livia's affairs. Since Livia is referred to as Augusta on the inscription, one can infer that Burrus assumed that position after the death of Augustus, which is when Livia received that name. It is uncertain whether Livia came to know Burrus while he was in the Guard and hired him from there or if Burrus himself had served under Tiberius and was then employed by Tiberius to manage Livia's property; either alternative is possible. What seems clear, however, is that after Livia died (or conceivably even before) Burrus was re-assigned to look after Tiberius' own vast holdings.

Both these positions would have brought Burrus into the closest circles of Tiberius' court. Tiberius was constantly looking for new revenues and new means of appropriating them (cf. Suet., Tib. 49). A clever and trusted procurator would have had little difficulty in grabbing his attention. In addition to the Emperor, Burrus would have had to deal with senators and wealthy knights who wished to involve the Emperor as partner in some venture of theirs.

Narbonese Marriage Alliances?

In all these dealings, one can assume Burrus was acquainted with the other notable Narbonese provincials at Rome at that time, particularly such senators as Valerius Asiaticus or Domitius Afer or even a fellow-knight such as L. Aponius. The question which arises is how close was their acquaintance and was there already perhaps a network developing among the Narbonese at Rome. No mention is made of such a network, though we do read that Augustus feared what the Gauls would do in Rome after the disaster of Varus in A.D. 9 (above p. 29f.). That at least implies that the Romans perceived the Gauls could work together. Furthermore, it appears the Spaniards were mutually supportive[165], so it is certainly possible the Narbonensians were likewise. Inscriptions found in Rome may, in fact, allude to that very idea. The first of these (*CIL* 6,16963) reads:

> Cn(aeus) Domitius Primigenius ¦ et Afrania Burri ¦ l(iberta) Caenis ¦ coniuges vivi fecerunt sibi et¦libertis libertabusq(ue) suis poste¦risque eorum¦in fronte p(ublice ?) XXXV H(oc) M(onumentum)

The text records that Afrania Caenis, the freedwoman of Burrus married Cnaeus Domitius Primigenius and that they had a number (at least four) of freedmen and freedwomen. Caenis must be the *liberta* of Burrus the Praetorian Prefect. As for Primigenius, his name indicates that he too was a freedman or, since the patron is not specifically mentioned, the son of one. The question arises at that point as to the identity of the Cnaeus Domitius after whom he is named. Admittedly, the patron could belong to the noble Domitii, who by now were intertwined with Augustus' descendants and from which branch sprang the infamous Nero. There were also, however, two prominent contemporary Cn. Domitii, namely Afer and Corbulo, who did not belong to the Roman Domitii but were, like Burrus, Narbonese. If Primigenius was a freedman of one of their houses, it would mean both patrons of this couple i.e., Burrus and Afer or Corbulo, had probably arranged the marriage. Such a union would have brought together the families of the wealthy patrons, particularly if one (or even both) of them was childless.

Another couple of inscriptions look no less suggestive of a possible Narbonese network at Rome.

> *D(is) M(anibus)* ¦ *Sex(to) Afranio Epagatho* ¦ *Lollia Tyche* ¦*coniugi* ¦ *carissimo et sibi* ¦ *fecit*
> (*CIL* 6,11200)
>
> *D(is) M(anibus) s(acrum)* ¦ *Sex(ti) Afrani Hesychi et* ¦ *Lolliae Faustae*
> (*CIL* 6,11203)

In these funerary inscriptions, two men who are likely the freedmen of Burrus, Epagathus and Hesychus, are identified as the husbands, respectively of Lollia Tyche and Lollia Fausta, both of whom, one would gather, were freedwomen of some wealthy member of the Lollian family. Once again, while it is impossible to prove, for lack of any mention of patron-affiliation, one can posit that these Lolliae may have been the *libertae* either of Lollia Paulina, the erstwhile wife of the arguably Narbonese senator, P. Memmius Regulus or of

Lollia Saturnina, the wife of the Vienna-born senator, D. Valerius Asiaticus. Some of the former slaves of Lollia Saturnina, for example, are noted in an inscription found at Rome (6,21473) and are identified as M. Lollius Saturninae l(ibertus) Princeps, Lollia Saturninae l(iberta) Methe and Lollia Saturninae l(iberta) Urbana. While, admittedly, the above inscriptions do not identify the patron of Lollia Tyche or Lollia Fausta as either Lollia Paulina or Lollia Saturnina, it is possible that, for some reason or other, the patron-affiliation was simply omitted. A political reason for this omission could be that some freedmen and freedwomen of Paulina and Saturnina refrained from making known their relationship to these noble women after the latter had fallen out of favour. Paulina came into conflict with the younger Agrippina over their contest for Claudius and was driven to suicide after Agrippina won. Saturnina was the wife of a man, Valerius Asiaticus, who had been convicted of treason. Her fate thereafter is unknown.

Although not certain, these inscriptions could conceivably prove that marital arrangements were made between Burrus, an equestrian Gaul, and a number of other possible Narbonese senators such as Cn. Domitius Afer (or possibly Cn. Domitius Corbulo) and D. Valerius Asiaticus (or again possibly P. Memmius Regulus). This sort of agreement and networking calls to mind the relationship between Domitius Afer and Curvius Tullus in which the former became the adoptive father of the latter's children. One is further reminded, by these family interactions and agreements, of the dynastic marriages in Gaul such as the one in which Dumnorix of the Aedui married the daughter of Orgetorix, king of the Helvetii (Caes., *BG* 1.9). A question arises, then, as to whether the arrangements set up by Burrus, a Vocontian, Asiaticus, an Allobrogian or Afer, of the Volcae Arecomici, went beyond a social agreement and, in fact, were the foundation for a political union or *collegium Gallicanum* which lobbied for the interests and promotion of Gallia Narbonensis. The evidence for this group, with its alliances and even internal divisions, and the effect on Roman politics which it made, will hopefully become more apparent later.

C. Iulius Rufus

There were other knights throughout the whole of Gaul, who did not hold the same power as, for instance, Burrus or L. Aponius but who, nonetheless, were locally influential during Tiberius' reign. Two such men whom we can identify from this period, C. Iulius Rufus and C. Iulius Victor are both from Mediolanum of the Santones or the modern Saintes. Of the two inscriptions bearing Rufus' name, the first, (AE. 1959, 81) reads:

> [Pro salut]*e Ti(beri) Caesaris Aug(usti)* ¦ *Amphitheatr*
> ¦[...p]*odio C(aius) Iul(ius) C(ai) f(ilius) Rufus s*
> ¦*acerdos Romae et Aug(usti)* ¦ ...*filii f(ilius)et nepos*
> *ex ciuitate* ¦ *Santon(um) d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia)*
> *fecerunt*

The text reveals the dedication by C. Iulius Rufus of an amphitheatre in Lugdunum, the seat of the cult of Rome and Augustus. Set up in honour of Tiberius, the inscription further identifies Rufus, (who was by this time, a grandfather) as a priest of that same cult. Based on this information, the inscription can be only dated broadly to the reign of Tiberius.

The second inscription (CIL 13,1036) found at Saintes on a triumphal arch, offers more details for the question of Rufus' background and date. The text, although fragmentary, records that Rufus dedicated the arch to Tiberius, to Tiberius' son, Drusus, and to Germanicus, his adopted son. As Germanicus seems from the wording of the inscription still to be alive at the time of its dedication, most scholars tend to date the arch to around A.D. 17-20[166]. The same commentators tend to date the amphitheatre to roughly the same time as the arch. No doubt, then, the arch and the amphitheatre represent an attempt by Rufus, both in his home-town and in Lugdunum, to display proudly his wealth and to set up a permanent memorial to his great achievement as the priest of Rome and Augustus, without doubt the most prestigious honour a Romanized Gaul could receive[167]. Besides this office, Rufus also was a praefectus fabrum, literally an officer of the military grounds crew, which Wells likens to an honorary aide-de-camp[168].

In addition to his career background and chronology, the text of the inscription also records Rufus' lineage, stating that he was the son of C. Iulius Otuaneunus, the grandson of C. Iulius Gedomo and the great-grandson of Epotsorovidus. If Rufus was already a grandfather by A.D. 20, as the first inscription (AE 1959, 81) indicates, that would make him presumably around fifty years old and put his own birth-date at around 30 B.C. If we assume a new generation arises every twenty-five years or so, it would be possible to establish the *floruit* of his grandfather, C. Iulius Gedomo, the first of the family to take the Roman *tria nomina*, squarely at the time of the Gallic wars. Gedomo, therefore, must have received Roman citizenship from Iulius Caesar himself for assistance in the campaign. The fact that Rufus is proud enough to name his totally non-Romanized great-grandfather, Epotsorovidus, no doubt means that his family were old Celtic nobility and that Epotsorovidus probably held considerable standing among the Santones.

C. Iulius Victor

The second man, C. Iulius Victor, is known to us from three fragmentary inscriptions (CIL 13,1042-5) which were set up by Victor's son of the same name. That the *floruit* of the elder Victor comes under the reign of Tiberius is confirmed not by the above mentioned inscriptions, which by themselves cannot be accurately dated, but by the evidence of CIL 13,1037 which was set up again by the younger Victor to the Emperor

Claudius in A.D. 49. That would then establish the elder Victor's prime at around A.D. 25, plus or minus five years which, in turn, would make him an exact contemporary of his fellow-equestrian and tribesman, C. Iulius Rufus.

Not only did Victor flourish around the same time as Rufus but both of them followed similar careers. Like Rufus, Victor was also a praefectus fabrum and later was selected, for an unspecified year, priest of Rome and Augustus. Victor served as well as tribune of the soldiers for what appears to be the Cohors I Belgarum[169].

The backgrounds of both men were similar though not identical. Although both are probably descended from the old Celtic aristocracy, Victor's father is listed not as C. Iulius but simply as Congonnetodubnus and his grandfather as Ag(ed)omapatis[170]. That would indicate that Victor was the first of his family to receive Roman citizenship and that unlike the family of Rufus which was enfranchised by Iulius Caesar, Victor was so rewarded by Augustus, perhaps relatively late in his reign. Made a citizen by Augustus, he nonetheless owed his subsequent promotion and prestige to Tiberius.

There are some further points which can be made about both Rufus and Victor. First, although prominent and wealthy, they are not figures found in any historical text. Their lives are known to us entirely from inscriptions. As such, while they may at some time have attended Tiberius' court as representatives of the concilium Galliarum, their influence there was probably not great. Second, both have Latin cognomina and hence are the first members of their families to drop their Celtic names, at least officially. Whether their fathers named them Rufus and Victor or if they changed their names themselves to appear more acceptably Roman is uncertain. Whatever the case, it may represent a policy under Augustus or Tiberius to pressure wealthy individuals in Gaul to accept Romanization more fully, the hope being that their example would accelerate the process among the still non-Romanized common-folk. The third and last point is the relevance of their being from the tribe of the Santones. Iulius Africanus, who was implicated in the conspiracy of Sejanus and condemned, has already been mentioned as having been from the same civitas. Furthermore, it is possible that Tiberius' close friend, Iulius Marinus, who also perished during that purge, was also Santonian (cf. CIL 13,1048). The reason why a disproportionate number of knights seem to come from this state during this period is because Mediolanum, the tribal capital, was also the provincial capital of Aquitania[171]. While the Santones were a fairly powerful state with a steady record of commitment to Rome - Augustus gave them "free status" - it is possible that after Mediolanum became the capital, many of the Santonian nobiles, likely all Roman knights, took over the general administration of the province; that, in turn, helped to strengthen their contacts with the Imperial bureaucracy in Rome and thereby improve their social and political prominence. That would explain why at least one Santonian (maybe two) became involved in the conspiracy of Sejanus which was otherwise almost exclusively restricted to Rome.

"*Ignoti*"

There will have been other knights during the time of Tiberius throughout Gaul who, although not noted in any historical work, were prominent in their own towns and perhaps even acquainted with the powerful circles in Rome. Most of them are unknown to us either because inscriptions to them have not been discovered or the ones which have been found have for some reason had their names erased. That is the case with the anonymous Narbonese knight referred to in the fragmentary inscription *CIL* 12,4371, which reads: *[duumv]ir quinquenna(lis)* ¦ *[colonia Iulia Paterna Narbo] M(artius) praefectus pro duu[mviro tribunu]s militum primipilus pra[ef?]* ¦ *[c]onlegio Honoris et virt[utis]*¦*[arbitratu?] Zenonis lib(erti)*. Christol and Demorigin draw a parallel between the career of this individual, who served consecutively as *primipilaris*, a tribune of the soldiers, *praefectus pro duomvir* of Narbo and *duomvir quinquennalis* (a local censor), and the career of other knights such as L. Aponius (*CIL* 12,4230) and yet another anonymous one found at Arelate (*AE*. 1954, 104)[172].

Of the twelve Gallic (or possibly Gallic) knights we have listed who were of historical importance or of, at least, epigraphical interest, three of them, Sex. Afranius Burrus, L. Aponius, and Votienus Montanus, were Narbonese, six (all Iulii), Sacrovir, Florus, Indus, Africanus, Rufus and Victor, were from Tres Galliae, while the last three, Iulius Marinus, Iulius Montanus and Iulius Celsus were of unknown provenance though conceivably they could have been from Gaul in the broadest sense. On the one hand, one could argue that among the knights whom we can identify under Tiberius, those from Tres Galliae were represented in relatively impressive numbers. On the other hand, it could also be said that those less-Romanized Gauls were mere footnotes in comparison to the influence wielded by the likes of Burrus or Votienus Montanus. Yet it would be wrong to assume that this pre-eminence of Narbonese provincials arose as part of a deliberate policy by Tiberius. If there is a reason why the knights of Tres Galliae did not reach high bureaucratic offices nor were adlected into the Senate, it is probably because they did not demand them. When one views such pro-Roman Gauls as Indus, Rufus or Victor or even nationalist ones like Sacrovir or Florus, one sees that their interest in Roman politics was minimal while their desire to preserve tribal connections and prestige was a far greater concern for them. Indus, for example, fought for Rome, yet he appears to have done so in order to achieve greater respect, and perhaps even fear, from his fellow tribesmen and his neighbors. This idea of the old aristocracy hoping to maintain or even improve its lines of connection and power in Gaul is even found to some extent in parts of Narbonensis where the population was still essentially Celtic. One observes this, for instance, in the influence wielded by Valerius Asiaticus (Tac., Ann. 9.1) whose home-state of the Allobroges was the only one of Gallia Bracata to have deliberated joining Vercingetorix (Caes., B.G. 7.64) or by Burrus, patron of Vasio, whose Vocontii (of whom he was patron) were, like the Allobroges, traditional and perhaps more independent than other Romanized Narbonese states.[173]

Conclusion

In conclusion, one can say that although Tiberius reportedly confiscated property unlawfully from some wealthy Gauls (Suet., Tib. 49), an action which may in part have caused the Gallic rebellion of A.D. 21, and although many in the country preferred his principal rivals such as Drusus his brother, Gaius Caesar and later Germanicus, he appears to have received an impressive overall approval there, perhaps higher than he received at Rome. This support may explain why he had more honorary inscriptions dedicated to him than any other Emperor. This is not surprising, particularly when one views the evidence for the promotion of Gauls under his principate. During his reign, we see the first positively identifiable senators from Gaul, most notably Valerius Asiaticus, Domitius

Afer and Iulius Graecinus and perhaps many others. Perhaps Claudius was thinking of the Narbonese senators when he said of Tiberius in his speech to the Senate in A.D. 48 Patruus Ti. Caesar omnem florem ubique coloniarum ac municipiorum bonorum scilicet virorum et locupletium in hac curia esse voluit (CIL 13,1668). The concern for Tiberius was not, as Augustus probably would have wanted, that these men be descendants of Roman colonists (which, it appears, most of them were not) but that they were boni (i.e., "reliable", "trustworthy", "usable") and locupletes. The reasons for this policy are, of course, debatable. One could argue that Tiberius had a broader vision of the Empire, recognising that while it was centered on Rome, it did not consist solely of it. Another explanation, perhaps more in keeping with his shrewd and self-protective nature, might be that he adlected Narbonese Gauls (and indeed municipal Italians and Spaniards) into the Senate because he did not trust the old, Roman senatorial class, which was always a potential threat to his family's dynasty; he decided instead to bring in new, hopefully appreciative and consequently loyal, blood to offset the influence of the old class. The reaction of the old families to this policy is perhaps best demonstrated in Tacitus' account of the confrontation between the young noble, Sulla, and the old, novus homo, Domitius Corbulo. The condescension which provoked Sulla's disdainful behaviour toward Corbulo and the support which Sulla then received seems to imply that old families had become embittered both by their increasing powerlessness and by the growing influence of provincial, specifically Gallic, senators.

Although there were rich citizens who lived in coloniae in Tres Galliae, the senators chosen at that time were exclusively Narbonese. While that fact may reflect long-standing Romanization in the south of Gaul, one could equally argue that no one in Tres Galliae ever actually made any move to become a senator. As mentioned before, the wealthy of northern Gaul seemed more interested in local, not imperial politics.

While the Narbonese in the Senate were chosen for their pre-eminence in military and legal matters, Tiberius only adlected them if he saw that their expertise and influence could secure his own position. For example, it was probably as a result of the rebellion by the Germanic armies early in his reign that Tiberius decided to appoint Valerius Asiaticus and Abudius Ruso, men whose influence and contacts on the Rhine could control any further disturbances there. Among the lawyers, it can be observed that Domitius Afer was used by Tiberius to neutralize potential threats within his family (i.e., Claudia Pulchra, Quintilius Varus) because he was an outsider and had no interests with either the Imperial family or the old Roman senatorial class. M. Porcius Cato (perhaps to be called Cato Narbonensis to avoid any confusion), the delator of the friend of Germanicus, Titius Sabinus, was used similarly for the Emperor's advantage. Perhaps as proof of how carefully Tiberius chose his Narbonese senators, despite the fact that many Roman senators fell victim to charges of treason or conspiracy, only one of the alleged senators from Gaul, Abudius Ruso, was so affected under Tiberius and his punishment was limited to exile from the city.

Among the equestrians, the means for promotion were similar to those for the senators. Exceptional military service, as exemplified by Sex. Afranius Burrus and L. Aponius, was the necessary prerequisite for important administrative posts and procuratorships. Often these individuals were of backgrounds just as wealthy and well-connected as those who became senators. One assumes then these knights, whether from Narbonensis or Tres Galliae, probably could have applied for senatorial rank but for reasons of business or even personal disinterest, elected to remain in the equestrian order.

The difference between the Gauls under the regime of Augustus and that of Tiberius is marked. In contrast to Augustus' suspicions of non-Romans, Tiberius seems almost to have preferred them. Placing his Gauls, both senators and knights, in visible positions of authority, Tiberius helped lay the foundations for one of the most influential lobby groups of the Julio-Claudian dynasty.

Chapter 3

CALIGULA

Caligula's Relations with Gaul and its People

Although Suetonius largely discredited the account that Caligula had been born in Colonia Agrippinensis, it is a fact, nonetheless, that the future Emperor did spend much of his early years in the German camps which his father Germanicus commanded. He was only two when those same legions not only rebelled against Tiberius but almost killed Germanicus himself after he had refused to be acclaimed as their Emperor. At one point Germanicus realized things had become so bad that he sent his wife and infant son, Gaius (Caligula), to Trier for their safety (Tac., Ann. 1.40). This was a cause of shame for the troops who had been rather attached to the young boy; in fact, it was they who had given him the name Caligula, i.e., "little big boots". The rebellion ended soon after and the troops, many of whom were no doubt from Gaul, returned to their barracks.

Caligula, then, had very early contact with Gauls, some of it playful, some of it perilous. He became very popular in the Gallic provinces when he succeeded Tiberius, a puzzling point when one considers how disastrous, almost catastrophic his reign was, not only for Rome but even for Gaul in particular. A number of stories arise out of Caligula's four-year reign which demonstrate how the Gauls, because of their wealth, were almost singled out to endure the folly and suffer the cruelty of the young Emperor.

The patience of Gauls was especially tested by Gaius' trip to their country in 39. The pretext for the expedition was to punish the Germans and perhaps even annex Britain, though the farcical manner in which the campaigns were carried out leads one to suspect that there was another motive for his presence there. In Dio's opinion, the real reason for the visit was to exploit the resources of Gaul and even of Spain, thereby restoring the squandered revenues of his previous two years (CD 59.21,3). This exploitation was directed equally against everyone in Gaul, subject states, allies and even Roman citizens (CD, ibid). Property was confiscated from the wealthy with or without a charge brought against them. Many were accused either of rebelling against him or of conspiring to rebel; in either case, the victims were summarily executed and their estates were confiscated by the Emperor (CD 59.21,4). In another episode both frivolous and brutal, Dio relates that Caligula, intending to acquire more funds for his gambling, ordered that the census-lists for Gaul be drawn up and that the richest men be thereupon executed and their property seized (CD 59.22,3f). The only victim of this incident who is actually named, Iulius Sacerdos, is mentioned as an unfortunate example of mistaken identity. Dio claims that although he was rich, he was not rich enough to be on the top of the census list and that he was killed because of a similarity of names[174]. Conceivably there was another, even wealthier dives in Gaul (and perhaps Lugdunum in particular) who was called Iulius Sacerdos or if not Sacerdos, perhaps Sanctus, Sacrovir or Sacratus, all of which cognomina are found in Tres Galliae[175].

Caligula's executions were largely restricted to the upper classes. Besides the fact that such murders facilitated property confiscations, Caligula, perhaps more than Tiberius, saw the rich, as opposed to the poor, as a constant threat to his security. Dio makes this point when he relates how a Gallic shoemaker, on seeing Gaius dressed as Jupiter and being asked by the Emperor what he perceived the Emperor to be, replied "A big fool" (CD 59.26,3). Caligula did not react angrily to that comment because, in Dio's words, he did not perceive the shoemaker to be a threat to him. On occasion, however, Caligula showed how his bloodthirstiness knew no social boundaries. Before he left Gaul, he considered massacring the legionaries who had rebelled in A.D. 14 and had besieged his father, Germanicus (Suet., Calig. 48). (He was obviously too young to have actually remembered that incident; anything he knew about it, he apparently learned through his mother.) Intending to slaughter every tenth man of these legionaries, Caligula had them march unarmed and surrounded by armed horsemen. Some of the legionaries became suspicious and on slipping away, fetched their weapons. Caligula noticed their reaction and was forced to flee from the gathering and depart directly for Rome[176].

Two final stories concerning Gauls reinforce the idea of Caligula's brutal and cruel nature. In the first story, we read how he had sentenced a number of Gauls and Greeks to be executed (no reason is given) and thereupon boasted with a pun that he had conquered "Gallo-graecia" (Suet., Calig. 29), normally another name for Galatia in Asia Minor. The second story concerns a gladiator, specifically a murmillo, named Columbus (Calig. 55). Suetonius writes that, after this Columbus had been wounded in a gladiatorial show, Caligula ordered that his wound should be rubbed with a poison which thereafter was called Columbinum. Although Suetonius nowhere mentions that this Columbus was a Gaul, the text of an inscription at Nemausus reveals an Aeduan murmillo named Columbus Serenianus (CIL 12,3325) . While it is impossible to say for certain, the Columbus of the story and the one of the inscription may well have been the same individual.

In a country where Germanicus was still revered, it must have been a terrible blow that his son, at whose accession there had been so much initial joy and promise, was such a disastrous failure not only as Emperor but even as a decent human being. Even if one accepts the possibility that many of these stories were exaggerated later by Caligula's enemies, one still has to concede the fact that Caligula in his short reign made many enemies throughout Gaul. The blood spilled was one serious factor in this regard, though no less important in the eyes of the Gallic nobiles were the confiscation and pilfering of their wealth which was the basis of their position and power in Gaul. They no doubt realized that they had no effective recourse to Caligula's court to air their grievances, though they surely must have had contacts with many Narbonese notables in Rome, men who maintained business or client connections in Tres Galliae. The next section of this chapter, therefore, will deal with Caligula's relationship with the Gallic senators and knights in Rome and in the Imperial service and discuss a possible role any of them may have played in his downfall.

Gallic Senators and Equestrians under Caligula

M. Aponius Saturninus

Only one new possible Gallic senator, M. Aponius Saturninus, emerged historically during the reign of Caligula; admittedly he may have been a senator before Caligula's accession, though definite evidence is lacking to say so with certainty[177]. R.D. Milns suggests that this Aponius was the son of L. Aponius[178], the comrade of Drusus, who was named in the previous chapter. The two Aponii are presumed related both because of the rarity of the nomen in the various histories of the period and because of a family sepulchre in Rome which contains men named both Lucius and Marcus Aponius (CIL 6, 37494)[179]. Since Lucius Aponius had an inscription dedicated to him at Baeterrae and his father had a Celtic name Boicnuus, it seems logical to suppose that Marcus Aponius, presumably his son, had roots and connections there as well.

Aponius Saturninus is mentioned in two historical references during the reign of Caligula. Suetonius states that when this senator was present at an auction of the Emperor's goods, he fell asleep (Suet., Calig. 38). Caligula drew the auctioneer's attention to this Aponius, identified as an ex-praetor, and advised the auctioneer to keep an eye on this senator who kept nodding his head. The auctioneer interpreted each nod for a bid and by the end of the sale, Aponius Saturninus had purchased thirteen gladiators for nine million sesterces.

In the second passage, reference is made to a senator only identified by the nomen, "Aponius", who for want of any other contemporaries of that name, is usually assumed to be Aponius Saturninus (Jos., AJ 19, 264). Josephus writes that Aponius was part of a delegation of senators led by one of the suffect consuls of A.D. 41, Q. Pomponius Secundus, which demanded before the newly-installed Emperor Claudius, a return to "liberty", a word which was used at this time to mean the republic. At first, the troops loyal to Claudius intended to kill Secundus but the new Emperor intervened and saved him. Those senators accompanying Secundus were not as fortunate, however, and in an affray which ensued, Aponius received an unspecified though presumably not life-threatening wound.

Although his son emerges later is the reign of Nero, this M. Aponius Saturninus is not afterwards mentioned[180].

D. Valerius Asiaticus

The remaining senators of Caligula's reign who were (or were supposedly) Gallic had already been enrolled in the curia before he became Emperor. Foremost among all of them for a number of reasons was D. Valerius Asiaticus, a consul suffectus for A.D. 35. The first reason for his pre-eminence and power was his own personal holdings. It is assumed that Asiaticus was a native dynast from Vienna, capital of the Allobroges[181] and that he must have been rich by virtue of that alone. Dio, in fact, refers to his being ἔν τε πολλῆ περιουσὶα, in other words, not just rich but very much so (CD 60. 27, 2-3). Although the ancient sources do not tell what his property consisted of, one might assume that he held lands in his own part of Gaul and probably had investments in Italy as well. P.J. Sijpesteijn, adding significantly to our information on this subject, argues that two papyri, one of which dates to the time Gaius was Emperor, prove that Asiaticus owned at least two estates (οὐσὶαι) in Egypt, one of which was at Philadelphia, the other at Euhemeria[182]. Sijpesteijn's idea that Asiaticus may have received these estates as a gift from Caligula or even that he acquired them on the recommendation of Antonia (cf. Tac., Ann. 9.3) who also owned property in Egypt, is possible though not provable.

Whatever the manner was that he assumed control of these properties, he would not have been able to visit them because of his senatorial rank.

As mentioned in the previous chapter (above p. 75), it was the wealth and position not only of Asiaticus but, no doubt, also of his unrecorded father which initially brought the Valerii Asiatici into contact with the Imperial family, specifically with Drusus, the governor of Gaul. This association may help to explain Asiaticus' contact with and devotion to Antonia, Drusus' wife (Ann. 9.3). Later, Asiaticus became one of Caligula's closest friends (Sen., Cons. 18.2). (That must have been an odd situation since the difference between Asiaticus' age (b. ca. 5 B.C.)[183] and Caligula's (b. 12 A.D.) was significant.) This friendship was further strengthened after Caligula ordered P. Memmius Regulus to divorce his wife, Lollia Paulina, so that he might marry her. Asiaticus was already married to Lollia Paulina's sister, Saturnina, so for the brief time that Caligula was married to Paulina, Caligula and Asiaticus, already good friends, became brothers-in-law.

However genuine this friendship was initially, it was not destined to survive. The reported responsibility for the break-up lay with Caligula, who caused irreparable damage with an off-the-cuff and less-than-sober boast. At a party which both Caligula and Asiaticus were attending, Seneca relates that Caligula shouted out (voce clarissima) what Asiaticus' wife, the above mentioned Saturnina, was like in bed (Cons. 18.2). Seneca described Asiaticus as a "bold man, not the sort who would endure insults from someone else with composure" and it is generally understood that this incident caused Asiaticus to become a partner in the eventual overthrow of Caligula[184].

Besides the close ties Asiaticus had with the Imperial family (however strained they came to be), he also had firm connections through his wife with other influential Roman families of that time. Lollia Saturnina was the daughter of M. Lollius, the consul of A.D. 13 and Volusia Saturnina whose grandfather L. Volusius Saturninus (apparently a cousin of Claudius Nero, Caligula's great-grandfather[185]) was consul suffectus in 12 B.C. Lollia Saturnina's uncle, who was also named L. Volusius Saturninus, was elected consul for A.D. 3 and later governed Dalmatia from at least A.D. 23 to sometime during the reign of Caligula[186]. He died in office as praefectus urbi in A.D. 56. His son, Quintus, coincidentally was consul for that year. Tacitus adds that the great-uncle (on the father's side) of Lollia Paulina (and therefore also of Lollia Saturnina) was M. Aurelius Cotta Messalinus, who was consul in A.D. 20 (Tac., Ann. 12.22). These men and no doubt others were connected, therefore, to Asiaticus through marriage. One can even add to this list Memmius Regulus, consul for A.D. 31, who, like Caligula, had been married briefly to Lollia Paulina and was hence, again like Caligula, Asiaticus' brother-in-law for a short time[187].

Although it is evident that Asiaticus' influence and dignitas were enhanced by his union with Lollia Saturnina, he also added to the prestige of her family because of his wealth and, perhaps more importantly, his associations with the military - in particular the Gauls therein and even more specifically those from Vienna and Allobrogian country. In writing about Asiaticus during the reign of Claudius, Tacitus writes, quando (Asiaticus) genitus Viennae multisque et validis propinquitatibus subnixus turbare gentiles nationes promptum haberet (Tac., Ann. 9.1). In other words, because of his connections stemming largely from his birthplace Vienna, he had a power which was substantial enough to cause serious problems.

The epigraphical evidence seems to corroborate the military importance of Vienna and by association confirms the power of Asiaticus, who was the principal citizen of Vienna during the reigns of Tiberius and Caligula. For example, of the twelve military officers from Gallia Narbonensis whom Pflaum identifies as having served from the time of Augustus through to that of Gaius, three were from Vienna - more than from any other single town - and one was from Augustum which was also a settlement of the Allobroges[188]. L. Vibrius Punicus is the most successful individual among those officers from Vienna (CIL 12, 2455) . According to the text of his inscription, which was set up by what seems to be his two sons, C. Vibrius Punicus and Marcus Vibrius Octavianus, L. Punicus served as a praefectus equitum, primipilus and tribunus militum, all standard equestrian positions, before being promoted to the prefecture, that is, the governorship, of Corsica. Pflaum argues that since his career, as it is recorded, is representative of one served before the reform of equestrian military careers by Claudius (Suet., Claud. 25), he must have performed his duties before that time. In addition, Pflaum states that Corsica began to be governed by a "homo militaris" in A.D. 6 and from both points he concludes that L. Vibrius Punicus served sometime between A.D. 6 and the equestrian reforms of Claudius[189]. When one considers how hesitant Augustus was in promoting native provincials to positions of authority, a reasonable terminus post quem might be A.D. 14, that is at the beginning of the reign of the more progressive Tiberius.

Of the remaining three Allobrogian officers whom we can identify from this period, Sex. Decius (CIL 12, 2430) and C. Passerius Afer (CIL 12, 1872) were tribuni militum. L. Iulius Fronto (CIL 12, 2393) was a praefectus equitum, and all three men eventually were chosen as quattuorviri of Vienna. C. Passerius Afer after serving as quattuorvir, was appointed flamen of the Divus Augustus and (presumably later) as flamen of Germanicus Caesar, the father of Caligula, by decree of the local decuriones. Besides officers, Vienna was home to a sizeable proportion of the common soldiery as well. Pflaum notes, for example, that of the forty-two inscriptions from Germania Superior which identify the specific home-town of soldiers from Narbonensis, eleven came from Vienna, more than twice as many, taken individually, as the numbers from Baeterrae (5) or Narbo (5), and nearly three times as numerous as from Tolosa (4) or Forum Julii (4)[190]. Another six recruits indicate only their tribe, Voltinia, which is normally indicative of Narbonese origin, and it is possible some of them might also have been from Vienna or at least from another Allobrogian settlement.

These officers and recruits, therefore, were probably the people, or were the sort of people, to whom Tacitus was referring when he mentioned Valerius Asiaticus' military connections. These ties, added to the powerful ones he had forged in Rome through marriage and his own personal wealth, clearly made him one of the most powerful individuals of Caligula's reign. Perhaps as a result of Asiaticus' power, Vienna was raised, sometime between 37-41, from a colonia Latina to a full colonia Romana, that is to say, with full citizen-rights. Gelzer, arguing from Philo (Leg. 285), attributes this colonial promotion directly to Asiaticus' position. He writes, "So empfangen verschiedene Städte Kolonialrecht, weil ihnen zufällig Freunde des Kaisars entstammten (Philo, ibid.). Es scheint, das damals insbesondere die Kolonie Vienna, die Geburtsstadt des Valerius Asiaticus (vgl. Sen., Dial II 18.2), das Ius Italicum erlangte"[191]. Although Philo implies that other cities were similarly rewarded[192], Vienna is the only example of such a promotion which we can positively identify.

Cn. Domitius Afer

A second Gallic senator prominent during this reign was Cn. Domitius Afer. Praetor under Tiberius, he became consul under Caligula, ironically, however, only after he was almost executed by that same Emperor. Caligula, it appears, hated Afer because of his involvement, as an agent of Tiberius and Sejanus[193], in prosecuting both Claudia Pulchra (Tac. Ann. 4.52), the cousin of Agrippina, and later Claudia's son, Quinctilius Varus (Tac. Ann. 4.66). Though this was one good reason why Caligula wanted Afer executed, it was not the only one. Afer, Dio reports, had set up a statue of Caligula and had inscribed at its base that the Emperor, though only twenty seven years old, was already consul for the second time (CD 59, 19, 2f.). Afer had hoped that this would win him the Emperor's favour, but to his dismay the opposite was the result. Gaius took the inscription to be a reproach, one which implied that he had attained the consulship unconstitutionally, that is, at too young an age. For that reason, the Emperor brought Afer before the Senate and read a scathing harangue against him. Afer was shrewd enough to realize that there was no chance of defending himself, so he decided simply to agree with everything Caligula said. When the Emperor had finished, Afer stood amazed, marvelling at Caligula's oratorical talent and the perfect accuracy of his speech. Finally the man that Quintilian considered summus orator (Inst. 10.1.118), fell prostrate before Caligula declaring that he feared him more as an orator than as Caesar.

Afer obviously had read Caligula's personality. His fine acting as well as a favourable word from the freedman Callistus, whose support Afer had courted and won, not only saved him from execution but actually raised him to one of Caligula's favourites. Immediately, in September of that year A.D. 39, Caligula dismissed the incumbent consuls [194], ostensibly because they had failed to give thanks for his birthday and appointed himself as the new consul with his new-found friend, Domitius Afer, as his colleague (CD 59.20,1).

With regard to his political and social connections, Afer is very different from his fellow-Narbonensian, Valerius Asiaticus. Whereas Asiaticus' power derived from his military contacts and marital ties, Afer's advancement through the system resulted from completely opposite circumstances, namely that he had absolutely no ties to the establishment. Accordingly, when Tiberius needed a prosecutor to bring down his enemies and potential threats, all of whom had friends or relatives in the senate, the ambitious, eloquent and unconnected Afer seemed the perfect choice. Secondly, while we know who the wife of Asiaticus was, we do not know the identity of Afer's wife or even if he was married. One name proposed, a certain Tertulla Afri (uxor) (CIL 6, 9330)[195], cannot be connected with certainty to Domitius Afer.

While his contacts may have been scarce when he first entered the forum and curia, he did however develop partnerships, alliances and contacts after he reached prominence. As already mentioned, for example, he struck up an alliance with Caligula's (and later Claudius') freedman Callistus, a link which saved his life and for which Afer must have been grateful. On a strictly professional level, he no doubt earned popularity and support from some circles of the senatorial class when he defended successfully such individuals as Volusenus Catulus (cf. CIL 6, 31573), Laelia, and Cloatilla. References to these cases are found throughout Quintilian.

One man with whom Afer developed a peculiar relationship was Sex. Curvius, who has already been mentioned in previous chapters. This man is regarded as the same individual whose name Sex Curvius Sex.f.Volt. Tullus is found in CIL 6, 16671. By virtue of his enrolment in the Voltinia tribe and his relationship with Afer, he too is assumed to have been Narbonese[196]. According to the younger Pliny, Afer became "comrade in paternity"[197] to Curvius' sons, Lucanus and Tullus (Ep. 8, 18) and had written a will, either in A.D. 41 or 42 - that is, either at the end of Caligula's reign or the beginning of Claudius' - making those boys his heirs. For some unexplained reason, however, perhaps because of a serious quarrel, Afer not only changed his last will but even brought Curvius to court. There Afer won possession of the defendant's property and had Curvius stripped of his citizenship. After the adoption, the official name of both "brothers Curvii" (cf. Mart. 9.51) became Cn. Domitius Afer Curvius Titius though they were distinguised by their last names, Lucanus or Tullus. Pliny concluded this story by remarking how ironical it was that a man who ruined their father then took his place.

Cn. Domitius Corbulo

A second Cn. Domitius, also arguably from Gaul, is the Corbulo who flourished during the time of Caligula. A question which arises, however, is whether this Corbulo is the former-praetor (above p. 87) who in A.D. 21 came into conflict with the young Roman nobilis, L. Sulla, over the question of senatorial privilege, or if it is, in fact, his son, who became a great general under Claudius and Nero. G.B. Townend (followed by Syme) has argued that the Corbulo under Caligula was, in fact, the general, and that any lack of specification in ancient histories dealing with whether the person is Corbulo the elder or the younger may derive from an intentional slip on the part of those historians (especially Tacitus), so as not to offend the sensibilities and family honour of Corbulo's daughter, Domitia Longina, who was still living at the time of his writing[198].

Dio writes that it was this Corbulo, (whom we shall identify as the younger), who complained of the state of the roads in Italy and accused many contractors and public officials of shoddy work and bribery (CD 59.15, 3f.). Caligula viewed this notion of persecuting such individuals as an excellent (even legal!) means of confiscating the property of others for his own personal accounts. In this way, therefore, Caligula used Corbulo just as Tiberius used Domitius Afer. Both senators were ambitious, and were capable of doing just about anything to please the sovereign and win favour for themselves.

For his help, Corbulo shared in the ill-gotten gains of the road-commission prosecutions. More importantly he was rewarded with a suffect-consulship in 39. While his office probably preceded that of Afer's in the same year, there is no evidence to prove that he was one of the consuls displaced by Caligula[199]. That would imply that he fell out of favour, something which does not agree with the known facts. Sometime after he was consul, though in the same year of A.D. 39, Caligula divorced Lollia Paulina on the false grounds that she was barren and shortly afterwards, perhaps in early 40, married Milonia Caesonia, who was pregnant with his child (CD 59.23.7f). This Milonia was the "soeur uterine"[200] of Domitius Corbulo, both being children of the many-married Vistilia. With this marriage, Corbulo had now become the Emperor's brother-in-law, and when Milonia's child, Julia

Drusilla, was born one month after the marriage, Corbulo became the uncle of a new heiress-presumptive to the throne.

Like Valerius Asiaticus, Corbulo had, besides his new-found associations with the Imperial family, close blood ties with many others in the senate. Sex. Vistilius, the ex-praetor under Tiberius (Tac., Ann. 6.9) was either his maternal grandfather or more likely perhaps, his uncle[201]. Through his mother's various marriages, he became half-brother to a number of other senators. In addition to Milonia Caesonia, he was half-brother to Q. Pomponius Secundus, who was consul in A.D. 41 when Caligula was assassinated, P. Pomponius Secundus, consul suffectus in A.D. 44, P. Suillius Rufus, consul sometime between 41 and 45[202]. Among his other relatives, the most important was his nephew, Sex. Cornelius (Scipio) Salvidienus Orfitus who became consul in A.D. 51. With this background, it is hardly surprising that Mucianus, speaking with Vespasian, referred to Corbulo as splendior origine quam nos sumus, fateor (Tac., Hist. 2.76).

M. Porcius Cato

Not many families benefitted as much from the reign of Caligula as did the extended family of Corbulo. For other senatorial families, even some Gallic ones, his reign was disastrous rather than beneficial. M. Porcius Cato, for example, the Narbonese duumvir of A.D. 36 who was appointed consul suffectus in the same year, appears to have been killed early in the reign of Caligula[203]. This man, who had in A.D. 27 been a partner in the entrapment of Titius Sabinus (Tac., Ann. 4.68), one of Germanicus' friends, was appointed curator aquarum in A.D. 38 (Frontin. Aq. 102), though he was replaced only a few months thereafter. It is presumed, because of Tacitus' prediction that all those who conspired against this Titius eventually met fatal punishments (Tac., Ann. 4, 71), that he was disposed of by Caligula because of his participation in the destruction of one of his father's friends. A question which arises from this incident is why Cato was appointed to so important a position in the first place. Perhaps the best explanation would be that in the early days of his principate, Caligula simply observed the workings of government and allowed his advisers or whoever to make any necessary appointments. Only after M. Porcius Cato had been appointed did someone, perhaps a rival, inform or remind Caligula of this Cato's past, thereby precipitating the curator's downfall. Though he inevitably still had friends and contacts at Rome (how else would he have been appointed curator aquarum?), none was influential enough with Caligula to save him or, perhaps more importantly, none was willing to try lest he suffer a similar fate.

L. Iulius Graecinus

The second senatorial casualty was L. Iulius Graecinus from Forum Julii. Of the two references to his death, the first is found in Tacitus and reads: Pater illi (i.e., Agricolae) Iulius Graecinus senatorii ordinis studio eloquentiae sapientiaeque notus, iisque ipsis virtutibus iram Gai Caesaris meritus: namque M. Silanum accusare iussus et, quia abnuerat, interfectus est (Tac., Agr. 4). The second brief account is found in Suetonius where he writes: Si exemplo magni animi opus est, utamur Graecini Iuli, viri egregii, quem C. Caesar occidit ob hoc unum, quod melior vir erat quam esse quemquam tyranno expedit (Suet., Ben. 2.21,5). The two versions agree in a general way that Graecinus' uprightness was a source of annoyance to Caligula. Tacitus' specific explanation that Graecinus was executed after he refused to prosecute Caligula's father-in-law is not as straight-forward as Tacitus' account would have us believe. Syme explains that M. Silanus died in A.D. 38 and that since Agricola, Graecinus' son, was born in A.D. 40, his father could not have died before that time[204]. So as to reconcile the stories, then, one can say that Graecinus' initial refusal to cooperate with Caligula put him in official disfavour and that this was used by the Emperor later to convict him on some concocted charge of disloyalty or treason.

Caligula obviously had hoped that he could use this provincial senator in the same way he used Domitius Corbulo or in the same way that Tiberius had used Domitius Afer or Porcius Cato, namely as a seemingly legitimate instrument for acquiring revenues and eradicating enemies. The difference between Graecinus and these other Gauls, however, was that Graecinus both lacked the ruthless ambition capable of damaging others and possessed a moral code more in keeping with a philosopher than an ambitious young senator[205]. Seneca demonstrates both of these points when he writes that Graecinus, on becoming praetor, refused to accept contributions from two corrupt senators, Paullus Fabius Persicus and Caninius Rebilus, because he feared becoming obliged to such people (Ben. 2.21.5). This inflexibility may indicate how strenuously Graecinus tried to remain non-aligned in the factional politics of the senate. This same avoidance of alliances may also explain how Caligula was able to take steps against him with relative ease and impunity as he knew no one would come to Graecinus' defense. After Graecinus was killed, his brother, the senator Marcus Graecinus, probably assumed the place of father for his nephew, Agricola.

* * *

The activity of other Gauls in Rome during Caligula's reign escapes our knowledge entirely because of the scarcity of information. Quintus Curtius Rufus, for instance, who has been connected by some to a duumvir of Arausio[206] and who was a praetor under Tiberius, is not mentioned in the chronicles of this reign; he does re-emerge, however, early in the reign of Claudius as consul for A.D. 45. Equally absent from any record of this period and almost conspicuous by it, is Sex.

Afranius Burrus, the equestrian procurator originally from Vasio. The inscription dedicated to him and found at Vasio (CIL 12, 5842, above p. 111), reads that he was procurator of Livia, Tiberius and Claudius and later became praetorian prefect. The fact that there is no mention of Caligula on the inscription probably does not reflect a leave-of-absence from Imperial business on Burrus' part but rather reflects the unofficial damnatio memoriae against Caligula[207]. For want of any further information, therefore, we can assume that he continued in his position as an imperial procurator from the period of Tiberius without interruption up to that of Claudius; that time, of course, includes the reign of Caligula. It is impossible, however, to determine whether he enjoyed any influence or power at this time beyond the normal duties of his post.

Gallic Involvement in the Plot against Caligula

Although the credit for the success of the plot against Caligula is generally given to the Praetorian tribunes, Cassius Chaerea and Cornelius Sabinus, these men were only able to carry out their plan because of the tacit approval or direct participation of a great number of other powerful individuals. Such men whether active participants, simply privy to or implicated later in the plot (or plots)[208], included at least four senators, Annius Vinicianus (Jos. AJ 19.18), Nonius Asprenas (AJ 19.98), Aemilius Regulus[209]

(AJ 19.17) and Valerius Asiaticus (Tac. Ann. 9.1), the praetorian prefect M. Arrecinus Clemens (CD 59, 29, 1) and an indefinite number of imperial freedmen (Suet., Calig. 56), among whom Callistus (CD 59.29,1) was specifically mentioned. Many other senators, most notably Cn. Sentius Saturninus, one of the consuls at the time of the assassination, were openly supportive of the action after the fact[210] (AJ 19 182), though the extent to which they enjoyed some previous knowledge of the affair, however probable that might be, is indeterminable.

It has already been stated that Caligula's pillaging of Gaul's wealth and citizenry made him few friends in that country. His death must have been as welcome there as in Rome itself and, when one considers how much Gaul suffered under Caligula, it would be odd to think that Gauls were not involved in the conspiracy. On the two most visible participants of the plot, Cassius Chaerea and Cornelius Sabenus, no information has come down to us regarding their origins. Tacitus reports that Chaerea served in the Lower German army during the revolt there in A.D. 14 (Tac., Ann. 1.32). Although that army received many recruits from Gaul and although his nomen is one of the more common ones found, for example, in Narbonensis[211], nothing in this information points specifically to his being Gallic in origin. Whatever his origin, the prevailing view is that he killed Caligula not because of his treatment of provincials but because of the innuendo which the Emperor spread against him. As to Cornelius Sabinus, we know less about him than we do of Chaerea. His name is too common and too widespread to judge anything from it.

The one Gaul who does emerge in the narratives as being implicated or involved in some way in Caligula's death is, of course, Valerius Asiaticus. He was described in A.D. 47 as the *praecipuus auctor interficiendi Gai Caesaris* (Tac., *Ann*. 9.1), implying that he instigated the whole conspiracy. This statement, however, was made by the prosecution at Asiaticus' treason trial and hence it should not be accepted as unequivocally true. Nonetheless, Asiaticus does emerge soon, after the actual assassination. When the soldiers, angry at the death of their Emperor, demanded to know the identity of the assassins, Asiaticus stood and, according to Dio, cried out "εἶθε ἐγώ αὐτόν ἀπέκτονειν"[212] (CD 59.30,2). This statement calmed the riot which had arisen, perhaps because the guards realised from it that, although the conspiracy itself may have been small, nonetheless, it had far wider support. Asiaticus' declaration, of course, does not negate the accusation that he was the *praecipuus auctor* in the conspiracy. When one considers the situation of an angered crowd of Caligula's armed supporters demanding the blood of his killers, one can easily understand that if Asiaticus was privy to the plot, he was not going to admit his involvement there.

Whether he was cognizant of the plot or just supportive of it, he definitely tried to take advantage of the situation which it produced. Josephus writes that while M. Vinicius, Caligula's brother-in-law, had designs on seizing the Empire after Caligula was killed, Asiaticus had similar ideas and was only restrained by another of the more prominent conspirators, Annius Vinicianus (AJ 19.252). This statement brings out two important points. First, it shows that Asiaticus, a former brother-in-law of the late Emperor, must have surveyed his own power base and concluded that he had sufficient support to take control. Besides his senatorial connections and his ties with the Germanic armies, he must have also been aware of ample support among the Praetorians without whom it would have been impossible to seize the principate and then maintain it.

Second, the fact that one of the conspirators, Vinicianus, restrained what may have been another conspirator, Asiaticus, from imperial designs shows that, while they were united in the goal of assassinating Caligula, each had his own personal reason or motive for joining the conspiracy and that sometimes the motives or designs of one conflicted with those of another. Vinicianus, for example, was a nephew of the other pretender, M. Vinicius[213], and he himself plotted against Claudius soon after his installation (CD 60.15, 1). Obviously, then, Asiaticus' designs on the Empire would have posed a threat to Vinicianus' own ambitions.

It is generally assumed that Asiaticus' involvement in the plot (or, at least his support of it after the fact) resulted from Caligula's public insult in which he declared at a party, attended by Asiaticus, what Asiaticus' wife was like in bed (Sen. *Const*. 18.2). Seneca follows this story with one concerning Cassius Chaerea and he mentions how Chaerea also suffered the insults and innuendo of the Emperor. The implication, of course, is that Asiaticus and Chaerea became partners in conspiracy largely to avenge their reputations and the slights on their manhood. Both were apparently impulsive and were described thus in similar terms by different authors. Tacitus, for instance, says that Chaerea was "*tum (A.D. 14) adulescens et animi ferox*" (*Ann*. 1.32), while Seneca writes that Asiaticus was a "*ferox vir et vix aequo animo alienas contumelias laturus*" (*Const*. 18.2).

Even if we accept that Valerius Asiaticus was a man governed by his own *ferocia*, nonetheless it is difficult to accept that this incident, almost frivolous in comparison to other examples of Caligula's behaviour, led him to plot the death of an Emperor. There may be another reason for his participation, one which may better reflect Asiaticus' desire for influence and lust for power. For a short period, while Caligula was married to Lollia Paulina, Asiaticus was the Emperor's brother-in-law, his wife being Paulina's sister. That gave Asiaticus the honour of being, at least by marriage, a member of the Imperial family and furthermore, gave him some claim, at least in his own mind, of possible succession[214]. Had any children been born to Paulina and Caligula, they would have been the first cousins of Asiaticus' own children. After Caligula divorced Paulina on the pretext that she was barren, any chance of Asiaticus' succeeding him was dashed since he no longer belonged, even indirectly, to the Imperial family.

Caligula's marriage to Milonia Caesonia in A.D. 40 was a further obstacle to Asiaticus' ambitions. Milonia was, as mentioned above (p. 91), the half-sister both of Domitius Corbulo, who was consul suffectus in the previous year, and of Q. Pomponius Secundus, the consul at the time of Caligula's assassination, a man who was kissing the Emperor's feet only shortly before he was killed (CD 59.29.5). Clearly this was a powerful family which had benefitted a great deal from Caligula's favour. No doubt many other families likewise profitted from Caligula and it was because of their support that those opposed to the Emperor were forced to conspire secretly against him.

In Chapter 2, it was argued that Domitius Corbulo was a Narbonese senator, possibly from Allobrogian country and even more specifically from Vienna, Asiaticus' home-city. If, then, Corbulo was from Vienna, this would indicate, again indirectly, that by divorcing Lollia Paulina and marrying Milonia Caesonia, Caligula was favouring Domitius Corbulo and his family and friends over Asiaticus and his; that, in turn, would give Corbulo the distinction of being the principal senator not only from Vienna but possibly from the whole province of Narbonensis.

There is further evidence that Caligula's choice of wives was the real reason for his overthrow and this might be proven by the identity of some of the chief conspirators. Josephus, for example, our most detailed source for this event, relates that Nonius Asprenas, the consul for A.D. 38, was one of the conspirators (AJ 19.98). What is not mentioned is that this man was a second cousin of Lollia Paulina and Lollia Saturnina, their grandmother, Nonia Polla, having been his great aunt[215].

A second name which emerges in the assassination and which may be relevant in this context is a certain Aquila, who, reportedly, was the assassin who dealt Caligula the final death-blow (AJ 19.110). Josephus further states that this was a point agreed on by all his sources. The fact that Josephus only gives his name in an incomplete way indicates either that the man was a fairly well-known individual who was commonly referred to simply as Aquila, or that Josephus had already introduced the character with his full name and did not need to write it out in toto again. Possibly it could be both these reasons. As to the prominent Aquilae during this period, there are two, namely M. Aquila Iulianus who was consul together with Nonius Asprenas in A.D. 38 and M. Arruntius Aquila who belonged to a prominent family and who is found as procurator of Pamphylia in A.D. 50. In Aquila

Iulianus' favour is the fact that his consular colleague was named specifically as a conspirator and by that relationship alone he could be implicated. Iulianus, however, is nowhere else mentioned in Josephus' account of the plot (or in any other account for that matter) as one would expect if he were one of the actual assassins.

There is some evidence, however, which points to Arruntius Aquila. Josephus writes that after Claudius, M. Vinicius and Valerius Asiaticus made their exit, Caligula himself departed, accompanied by Paulus Arruntius (AJ 19.102). Not only does this Paulus disappear immediately thereafter from Josephus' assassination-narrative, but his name is nowhere else attested in any other historical or epigraphical source. In addition to this point, Feldman relates that there is a problem textually with the name Paulus, which is not found in the Greek manuscripts of Josephus but in a Latin version[216]. What may have happened is that originally Josephus wrote Aquila Arruntius, which in Greek was written Ἀκύλας Ἀρρύντιος. A copyist may, inadvertently, then have metathesized the first two letters of the first name, thereby leaving Κάυλας. A subsequent copyist, not recognising this form, assumed the name had to be the Roman name Πάυλος and then "corrected" it. By showing how this "Paulus" Arruntius and Aquila may have been one and the same man, i.e., Arruntius Aquila, we get a slightly better picture of Caligula's last few minutes, namely, that he was accompanied, and perhaps even guided, by Aquila into the ambush and that after the other conspirators had struck at him, Aquila himself plunged the final dagger.

The motives for Aquila's partnership in the plot might be explained through his belonging to the gens Arruntia. Tacitus writes that L. Sulla, the young nobilis who in A.D. 21 insulted Domitius Corbulo, the father of the consul of the same name of A.D. 39 and step-father of Milonia Caesonia, was related to the Arruntii (Tac., Ann. 3.31). Although the family was forced to apologise for the young Sulla's imprudence, it is quite possible that the family bore a long grudge against the Corbulones and now deeply resented the access that family had to the Emperor's inner circle court. More importantly, with the birth of Julia Drusilla, the daughter of Milonia and Caligula, Corbulo became the uncle of the heir-presumptive, an idea which his enemies would have found hard to tolerate.

Therefore, when Valerius Asiaticus was later described as the praecipuus auctor Gai Caesaris interficiendi (Tac., Ann. 9.1), it may have been understood that he had been the ringleader, bringing together people who had been slighted or more importantly who feared that a new faction was going to erode much of the influence and power which they had hitherto enjoyed.

This idea is further corroborated by the tragic and brutal murder of Milonia and her daughter, Julia Drusilla.

Josephus alone relates that some of the conspirators protested the idea that the wife and child be killed (Jos., AJ 19.192). Certainly, Milonia had no more claim to power now that Caligula was gone and the child, for whatever her father was, was still the great-great-granddaughter of Augustus. Nonetheless, other conspirators accused Milonia of complicity in his reign and this argument appears to have won. Cassius Chaerea ordered a certain Iulius Lupus, a tribune of the Praetorians and a relative of the Prefect M. Arrecinus Clemens to execute both mother and child (Jos., AJ 19.190). In Suetonius' account, Milonia was stabbed, while the infant was dashed against the wall (*filia parieti illisa*: *Calig.* 59).

At this point one might wonder what the reaction of Milonia's extended family was to her murder and to the coup in general. We know certainly how one of Milonia's half-brothers, Q. Pomponius Secundus, the consul at the time of the assassination, reacted. He opposed Claudius' claim to the principate, demanding instead liberty, which was the code-word for the restoration of the republic (Jos., AJ 19.263). This he demanded in the presence of Claudius himself and the Praetorians, an incident which almost cost him his life and which led one of his senatorial supporters, Aponius Saturninus to be wounded. Secundus, together with his colleague Cn. Sentius Saturninus, even went so far as to try to stop Claudius declaring war on him (Jos., AJ 2.205). It is not certain whether this poorly detailed statement refers to the same incident which Tacitus mentions when he says that Secundus was driven to the necessity of civil war (ultimately because of an accusation by his other half-brother, P. Suillius Rufus, Ann. 13.43), or whether Tacitus' statement refers to a subsequent rebellion, involving the governor of Dalmatia, L. Arruntius Furius Camillus Scribonianus (CD 60.15,2)[217]. Whatever the fact of the matter, Secundus appears to have died in disgrace as his name was erased from the consular lists - the result, no doubt, of an official decree of damnatio memoriae[218].

In contrast to the knowledge we have of Pomponius' reaction to the overthrow, there is no mention at all of Corbulo's reaction or even his whereabouts while this episode was unfolding. Perhaps unlike his half-brother, Corbulo decided to keep a very low profile during that critical time because of his close associations with the previous regime. In fact, he does not re-emerge historically until A.D. 43 when he was reprimanded for his litigations against road-contractors (it was for presenting those that he was rewarded with the consulship) and ordered to pay back monies he had acquired by those nefarious means (CD 60. 17.2).

Summary and Conclusion

Although Tacitus' account of the reign of Caligula is missing, we can learn much from the remaining extant sources - Cassius Dio, Josephus, Suetonius and others - both about his reign and, more particularly, about the role the Gauls played during that period. It appears that although Caligula was disliked, despised or feared, nevertheless senators feigned support for him and then played on his weaknesses, through flattery or criminal complicity, in order to improve their standing and power. However deft the senators from more established families were at playing this game, some of the more-recently installed Gallic senators showed that they could equally match their established peers in the sport of politics and survival. Perhaps the best example of this is Domitius Afer, who came very close to being killed because of his past involvement in the prosecution of some of Caligula's cousins (Tac., Ann. 4.52, 4.66). After he had been condemned by a speech which Caligula delivered before the senate, he was able, through flattery and sheer wiliness, to save himself by proclaiming how flawless and unequalled the Emperor was in his oratorical skills. Afer's perceptive recognition of Caligula's pride and credulity not only calmed the Emperor's grudge against him (which, of course, saved his life), but it even elevated Afer, Caligula's new friend, to the consulship.

Domitius Corbulo, who may have been Gallic (at least on his father's side), was another senator who profited from collusion in Caligula's crimes. Corbulo prosecuted a number of road-contractors and public officials and handed over to Caligula the exorbitant fines of which he received a share. He, like Afer, was made consul and his influence appears to have become even more evident thereafter. In A.D. 40, the year after his consulship, Caligula married Corbulo's half-sister, Milonia Caesonia. At least one other half-sibling, Q. Pomponius Secundus, and maybe a second, P. Sullius Rufus[219], became consuls in the last year of Caligula's reign.

Not all Gallic senators enjoyed the same advancement or favour under Caligula. L. Iulius Graecinus, for instance, hardly receptive to the idea of abetting the Emperor in unjust causes, refused to prosecute Caligula's father-in-law, M. Silanus in A.D. 38/39 and for that refusal earned the Emperor's suspicion and hatred. He was later executed, having been convicted on unspecified though presumably false grounds. Another probable Gallic senator, M. Porcius Cato of Narbo, the curator aquarum for one month in A.D. 38, perished not because of his high moral standards but because the man on whom he had once informed was a friend of Caligula's father. Hated, therefore, for the same reason for which Caligula initially hated Dominius Afer, he was apparently not crafty or eloquent enough to persuade Caligula to change his mind.

The most important Gallic figure during this reign and, in fact, one of the most important senatorial figures irrespective of origin, was Valerius Asiaticus. As mentioned in the previous chapter, (above p. 74), his power derived first from his connections with the army. It is hardly coincidence then, that during his heyday, we can identify a number of prominent, Viennese officers in the Roman army such as C. Vibrius Punicus, the tribunus militum who rose eventually to become prefect of Corsica, Sex. Decius and C. Passerius Afer, both tribuni militum and L. Iulius Fronto, a praefectus equitum; conceivably these promotions may have resulted from Asiaticus' intercession and patronage.

The military connection, again as mentioned earlier, provided Asiaticus with his introduction to Roman society. It was through this association that he first came in contact with Drusus' family, a fact exemplified both by his devotion to Antonia, Drusus' wife, and his friendship to Caligula, Drusus' grandson. His acceptance by the Imperial family no doubt helped to facilitate his marriage into the prominent family of the Lollii. Furthermore, those contacts which he forged from his marriage to Lollia Saturnina became more noticeable during the reign of Caligula. First, we see how two of Saturnina's second cousins, P. Nonius Asprenas and Sex. Nonius Quintilianus, were chosen consuls in A.D. 38[220]. Secondly, Saturnina's uncle, L. Volusius Saturninus, who had served as governor of Dalmatia from 34-40, became prefect of the city immediately thereafter and remained so following Caligula's assassination. Thirdly, and most importantly, for a brief time while Caligula was married to Lollia Paulina, he was Asiaticus' brother-in-law, thereby making Asiaticus not only a friend of the imperial family but a part of it. It was, no doubt, because of his widespread connections and influence that Vienna became a full Roman colony at this time.

Asiaticus' abrupt volte-face - from close friend of Caligula to a supporter, if not active partner in his assassination - is usually explained as a reaction to Caligula's public insult of Asiaticus and his wife. While such a story corresponds to other accounts of Caligula's behaviour and while we can assume Asiaticus became terribly angry because of it, it is arguable whether that was the sole reason why he embraced the other conspirators or even organized them. Perhaps a more compelling reason for participation in the plot was not Caligula's adultery with Saturnina but rather his divorce from Paulina. By doing that, Caligula stripped Asiaticus of any claim of membership in the Imperial family. That, perhaps, affected his prestige more than his being cuckolded and it may well have forced him to re-think some of his future plans.

The problem became even more acute for Asiaticus when Caligula married Milonia Caesonia, half-sister of Corbulo, and produced Julia Drusilla. This now made Corbulo an in-law to Caligula and uncle to the heiress-presumptive. Consequently, if we can assume Corbulo was Narbonese, he now became the principal senator from Gaul, an honour which Asiaticus, having been that province's first consul, had hitherto enjoyed.

As to the various reasons which brought together the conspirators, such as vengeance, liberty, personal ambition, Asiaticus appears to have joined for the last reason, specifically because he feared his influence was going to be eroded because of Caligula's choice of wife. The reason for his involvement, therefore, was a personal one, hardly something so noble that he could make it a rallying cry to enlist others to his cause. His confederates, then, were all Italians who likewise had some grudge or suspicion against Caligula. To the best of our knowledge, no other Gallic senator supported him or joined in the plot even though some of them must have been disturbed by Caligula's atrocities in Gaul two years before. The only possible Narbonese senator who does emerge in the narrative of Caligula's assassination was the ex-praetor, M. Aponius Saturninus. He, however, is found on the opposite side of Asiaticus, as part of Pomponius Secundus' delegation which opposed the installation of the new faction under Claudius.

Upon examining the evidence of the reigns of Augustus, Tiberius and Caligula, one can observe a steady progress in the influence and power of the Gallic notables in Roman society. This advancement was based as much on the personality of the Emperor as it was on the wealth and military connections of the Gauls in question. Augustus, for example, because of his Italian ethnocentrism and his suspicion of foreigners (and perhaps Gauls in particular) was reluctant to promote Gauls to any positions of authority. Consequently, the list of Gallic senators under his reign is very short. Under Tiberius, however, many senators can be identified as being either definitively Gallic or arguably so.

There are many reasons why Tiberius opened the curia so liberally to these provincials. First, he undoubtedly recognised the importance of Gaul strategically and financially as a centre and bulwark of the Western Empire. Representation from that region in his own Upper House was therefore vital in maintaining good relations with the inhabitants there. Secondly, he had served in the region and had become acquainted and perhaps friendly with many of Gaul's chief citizens. In a senate which was often hostile to him, the appointment of friends whom he could trust added much to his security and peace of mind. Lastly, he recognised that many of these provincials were hungry for honours and were capable of doing just about anything to receive them. As they were detached initially from the political factions and family ties of the Senate, Tiberius found that some of them were useful tools in carrying out his own personal vendettas.

Although there is no sure evidence that Caligula appointed any new senators from Narbonensis, those who were already there, on appointment by Tiberius, made impressive gains in personal power, even to the point that two of them - Asiaticus and Corbulo - became for a brief moment members of the extended Imperial family. Caligula's youth, inexperience and sheer gullibility made this possible, a situation which could not have happened under the cautious and basically xenophobic Augustus or even under the more enlightened Tiberius. Ironically, assuming we accept the fact that

Asiaticus was the conspiracy's "praecipuus auctor", then Caligula's practice of admitting Gauls into his inner circle eventually led to his death. The conspiracy of this one Gaul and his confederates actually led to the installation of the first "Gallic" emperor which, of course, was not Valerius Asiaticus as he himself had hoped, but Claudius, born at Lugdunum in Tres Galliae on August 1, 10 B.C.

Chapter 4

CLAUDIUS

The verdict of most modern commentators has been that the reign of Claudius was pro-Gallic. Hatt calls him "Claude l'Empereur Gaulois"[221] while for Fabia, Claudius was not exactly "Gaulish" but at least "gallophile"[222]. This Emperor is perceived, particularly with reference to the decree allowing Gauls admission in the senate, as the man who supported Gallic rights in face of the normal "Gallophobie"[223] and "antigallischen und antitranspadanischen Ressentiments"[224] of the Senate and Roman society in general. Claudius' behaviour and policy is usually explained by the fact that he had been born at Lugdunum during the governorship of his father[225] and that he always had a sentimental attachment to the country where he first saw the light. Seneca jokes about this in the _Apocolocyntosis_ when he calls Claudius _Gallus germanus_, a genuine Gaul (Sen. _Apoc_ 6.6) - a pun, of course, on the word for "German".

It is true that overall the four provinces of Gaul benefitted greatly from the reign of their native son. Colonies were established (or reinforced), both in Tres Galliae, specifically at the modern Le Puy (Colonia Vellavorum) and at Lugdunum, in Germany at Cologne and Trier and apparently in Narbonensis at Narbo itself[226]. The tribe of the Silvanectes, situated on the border between Gallia Lugdunensis and Belgica, was organized under Claudius as a civitas[227], a status which granted it more independence in local affairs, while a town between the Turones and the Bituriges, which enjoyed the patronage of the Emperor, named itself Claudiomagus (the modern Clion)[228]. In addition to the construction of aqueducts, baths, theatres and amphitheatres throughout Tres Galliae, Claudius upgraded and extended the road-system which had been initially constructed under Agrippa over seventy years before (Strabo 4.6.11)[229]. All in all, this was a policy of Romanization that set out to quash any anti-Roman, pro-Gallic nationalist sentiment not by force of arms but rather by benevolent support and positive re-inforcement.

The idea of calling Claudius a gallophile is, nevertheless, misleading. Although Gaul made great strides under his rule in acquiring both Roman status and material Romanization, many other places did as well[230]; he was not, in other words, so obsessed with Gaul that he ignored the other provinces of the Empire. There is not even any real proof, other than Seneca's satire, that he bore any special attachment to Gaul as his place of birth. He was first and foremost a Roman patrician whose interest as Emperor was the security of the Empire for its Roman citizens. In fact, Seneca himself recognised Claudius' wider perspective when he wrote, somewhat though not entirely tongue-in-cheek, "(Claudius) constituerat enim omnes Graecos, Gallos, Hispanos Britannos togatos videre" (Apoc 3.13). Anything that Claudius did for the benefit of Gaul, therefore, was simply part of his broader plan of Romanizing the whole Empire[231].

The right of Gauls from Gallia Comata to be admitted into the Senate and the right of Narbonese senators to visit their estates without imperial permission are the two most notable privileges awarded to Gaul under Claudius. Certainly, it can be argued that these decrees were enacted to gain the support of wealthy nobles in Gaul for his policy of Romanization. It can also be argued, however, that it is doubtful Claudius acted alone on these measures; most likely, he will have been influenced in his deliberations and decisions by Gallic senators and knights who served as his advisors for Gallic affairs.

These Gallic senators - the ones in place before the decree of A.D. 48, those from Gallia Comata who became senators because of it soon afterwards, and others from Narbonensis who likewise emerged after A.D. 48 though not because of this decree - give this chapter a complexity unlike any other. It is impossible, for instance, to discuss the new senators from Tres Galliae without first examining the decree, just as it is impossible to discuss the decree without first investigating the events or the associated personnages involved which led to the enactment of the decree. Unlike previous chapters, therefore, which discussed first Gallic senators, then Gallic knights before finally proceeding to a particular inference, this chapter will treat chronologically the individuals and events as they emerged historically. The conclusion will attempt to bring all individuals and events into a broader picture and demonstrate the influence which this group as a whole enjoyed.

Claudius and the Gauls

Claudius ascended a very unstable throne after the murder of his nephew, Caligula. Many of those who participated in or were privy to the plot had personal ambitions for the principate (Jos. AJ XIX 251-252) while those not involved had serious misgivings about Claudius - or for that matter anyone else - succeeding to power. Many, most notably the consul Q. Pomponius Secundus, supported the idea of restoring the Republic in the wake of the atrocities of the now late Caligula. This man, the half-brother of Corbulo, even went so far as to declare war on Claudius, an event which never actually transpired but which did bring home to Claudius some idea of the opposition he faced[232].

Despite such treasonable conduct, Claudius was persuaded to make peace both with the senators who were involved in Caligula's assassination and those who, either out of personal ambition or republican aspirations, opposed his succession (Jos., AJ 19.265). Cassius Chaerea, the principal assassin of Caligula, and Iulius Lupus, the murderer of Milonia Caesonia, were executed (Jos., AJ 19.271), but the senators involved, (most notably for our purposes, Valerius Asiaticus), were spared of any criminal proceedings[233]. In fact, such men as Asiaticus, M. Vinicius, et al., were not only pardoned, but profited greatly during the initial years of this new regime, an outcome which casts doubts on the innocence of Claudius in Caligula's overthrow, not that the question is of relevance for present purposes.

Cn. Domitius Corbulo

The year A.D. 43 was eventful for Gauls both in Rome and in Gaul itself. Claudius became consul for the third time (CD 60.17,1) and among many initiatives he began was to right some of the wrongs committed by Caligula. Those who had profited for no just cause by Caligula's favour were told to return to the treasury any moneys they had received; conversely, those who suffered unjustly at the hands of the previous administration had their money restored. It was at this time that Corbulo's name re-emerged. Under Gaius, Corbulo had accused public officials and road contractors of corruption and levied heavy fines on them, all essentially as a revenue enhancement scheme on Caligula's behalf[234]. Dio fails to make clear whether any of the money paid back to those officials came out of Corbulo's own accounts (CD. 60.17.2), but even if this was not the case, his current disgrace diminished his dignity far more than any monetary penalties.

Corbulo was obviously no ally of the conspirators who had plotted against Caligula and who were now entrenched in Claudius' privy council. He had been a loyal supporter of the previous regime and his half-sister became Caligula's fourth (and final) wife. More recently, another half-sibling, Q. Pomponius Secundus had perished in the rebellion of A.D. 42. One suspects that many within Claudius' circle had suspicions about Corbulo because of his family background but for want of any real evidence against him were forced to dredge up some of his past misdemeanors, if for no other reason than to keep him in check.

Catonius Iustus

In the same year, Catonius Iustus is registered as one of the praetorian prefects. This name has already arisen (above p. 66) in connection with the rebellion in Pannonia at the beginning of the reign of Tiberius. Tacitus reports that during this incident, Catonius Iustus, centurio primi ordinis was chosen, together with the son of Q. Iunius Blaesus and L. Aponius, to meet with the Emperor in order to discuss the grievances of the legionairies (Ann. 1.29). It was proposed above (p. 66) that this Catonius bore a Gallic name[235], found essentially around the area of Augusta Treverorum[236] and that it was a likely enough consequence that he was a native of that part of Belgica.

The usual assumption, based largely on the rarity of his name, that the centurion-delegate to Tiberius and Claudius' praetorian prefect were the same individual[237], an identification difficult to prove unequivocally but, nonetheless, arguable. Catonius Iustus, we are told, was a "centurion of the first order" in A.D. 14. If we follow Parker's view that such officers were "soldiers of experience"[238] (therefore, with fifteen to twenty years service?), this would imply that, at the time of the Pannonian rebellion, he was between thirty-five to forty years old. It would, then, follow that in A.D. 43 or twenty-nine years later, he would have been in the neighborhood of sixty-four to sixty-nine years of age. However advanced that may have seemed, his age may not have been a barrier to such a position; in fact, since the job demanded experience and proven loyalty, an advanced age was probably regarded as an asset[239].

Catonius appears to have succeeded Arrecinus Clemens, one of the prefects for A.D. 41 who is recorded to have given tacit approval of the assassination plot against Caligula (Jos., AJ 19.37)[240]. Since Arrecinus Clemens retired honourably from his post (Tac., Hist. 4.68), it seems possible that Catonius, as his successor, was likewise involved in the plot in some way. Though the evidence is very slender one might suppose that if he was from Belgica, around Trier, an area where Valerius Asiaticus of Vienna was influential (Tac., Ann. 9.1), he may have been involved in the plot through his connection with Asiaticus. Thereafter he was recommended for the praetorian prefecture by the Viennese senator after Arrecinus retired. Whatever the reason he was chosen, if we assume that the name Catonius was Gallic, then this man will be the earliest praetorian prefect we can determine who was a "Gallus germanus" (Sen., Apoc., 6).

Catonius' loyalty to Claudius appears to have been his downfall. According to Dio, he had intended to inform Claudius of Messalina's blatant promiscuity (CD 60.18.3). However, Messalina, became aware of his intent and promptly had him permanently removed. The fate of his family is thereafter unknown[241].

Q. Curtius Rufus

Another name, Q. Curtius Rufus, emerged in A.D. 43. Gallivan, following Barbieri, argues that in September-October of that year Curtius served as consul suffectus[242]. Reference has already been made to this Rufus (above p. 92) as one who had served as praetor under Tiberius but whose origins were uncertain even during that time. He has been connected to an individual also named Q. Curtius Rufus whose name occurs in an inscription at Arausio (AE, 1986, 475) which identifies him as a duumvir of that colony. The fact that the two individuals bore identical tria nomina and that the inscription apparently dates to the first half of the first century raises the possibility that the two references relate to the same man. Whether he was the same as the Q. Curtius referred to as an orator or the Curtius Rufus who wrote the history of Alexander the Great is likewise conceivable though not provable[243].

In Tacitus' account, Rufus is described as a disagreeable fellow adversus superiores tristi adulatione, adrogans minoribus, inter pares difficili (Tac., Ann. 11.21). He, nevertheless did have friends who assisted him in reaching the praetorship (ibid.) and the same people may have likewise propelled him to the consulship. When one considers his connections, also the year in which he became consul, one might assume that his friends now held powerful positions in the new regime, possibly as a result of or as a reward for their involvement in Caligula's overthrow. Perhaps, like Catonius Iustus, he too may have been a Gaul who was indebted to the patronage of the increasingly more influential Valerius Asiaticus.

D. Valerius Asiaticus

The most important event of A.D. 43 was Claudius' invasion of Britain, a campaign in which Asiaticus himself is reported to have played an important role. L. Vitellius refers in A.D. 47 to Asiaticus' recens adversus Britanniam militia (Tac., Ann 9.3), a statement which seems to allude to the conquest of the island in 43-44. Vitellius does not specify exactly what the service was, but since Asiaticus was a former consul (A.D. 35), a friend and former brother-in-law of Caligula and a long-standing friend of the present emperor, he probably served on the war-time advisory council as a comes principis. One can only speculate on his duties but, as a native of Gaul who understood or even spoke Gallic, he may have been employed on diplomatic missions, negotiating with local British kings. Although there is no evidence, it is possible that because of his service, Asiaticus, like the legionary commanders Aulus Plautius[244], Cn. Hosidius Geta (CD 60.20.4), M. Crassus Frugi (Suet., Claud. 17)[245] and Vespasian[246] (Suet., Vesp. 4), may have been one of the ceteri who received ornamenta triumphalia from Claudius (Suet., Claud. 17). This would have been the first time a native of Gaul received such an honour, a distinction which would have greatly enhanced his already notable prestige. Vitellius states that it was Asiaticus' involvement in Caligula's murder which made him clarus in urbe (Ann. 9.2); the fact that his fame "spread throughout the provinces" (ibid.) may have been a result of his military service in Britain.

Asiaticus was obviously not the only Gaul who took part in Claudius' great campaign. The fact that the armies were taken from Germany and the neighbouring frontier where the Gauls were particularly well-represented, probably means that there were literally thousands of Gallic legionnairies who were there present[247]. Holder suggests on the basis of epigraphical evidence that, besides the legionaries, part of the invasion force may have included the *ala Indiana Gallorum*, the *ala Augusta Gallorum Proculeiana* and the *cohors I Alpinorum, cohors I Aquitanorum* and *cohortes I-V Gallorum*[248]. These Gauls would have been especially useful in scouting and gathering information. The Gauls were a kindred people to the Britons, speaking essentially the same language as the Britons spoke (Tac., *Agr*. 11). Besides, some of these Gauls had probably already visited the island and as such, knew the geography better than the other invaders.

M. Aper

Among the more prominent Gallic soldiers who served (or are suggested to have served) in the expedition to Britain was M. Aper, the distinguished Gallic orator under Vespasian. The evidence for connecting him to the campaign of A.D. 43 is a statement in Tacitus' *Dialogus* in which Aper himself says: *Nam ipse ego in Britannia vidi senem qui se fateretur ei pugnae interfuisse qua Caesarem inferentem arma Britanniae arcere litoribus et pellere adgressi sunt* (*Dial*. 7). The veracity of this man's claim to have helped repel Iulius Caesar from the shores of Britain in 55 B.C. might be called into question except for the fact that Aper immediately before the above quotation hints that the man's age was one hundred and twenty years. If, then, the man was so old in A.D. 43, this would indicate that in the year Iulius Caesar invaded

Britain (i.e., 55 B.C.), he would have been from the military standpoint at the prime age of twenty-three years. The fact that the old man referred in his conversation (*qui se fateretur*) with Aper to the invasion of 55 B.C. might further strengthen the idea, promoted largely by Syme[249], that Aper served in the Claudian expedition. It is possible that the old man was speaking of the irony in having once driven the Romans away but then living long enough afterwards to see them come back over ninety years later.

C. Iulius Camillus

A second prominent Gaul whom we can identify as having served in A.D. 43 is a certain C. Iulius Camillus, doubtless a Helvetian *nobilis*, from Aventicum. Although not mentioned historically, his name and service record are noted on an inscription (*CIL* 13, 5093) which reads thus:

> *[C]Iul*. *C*.*f*. *Fab. Camillo* ¦ *[s]ac. Aug. mag. trib. mil.*¦
> *[l]eg. IIII Maced. hasta pura* ¦ *[e]t corona aurea donato*¦
> *[a] Ti. Claudio Caesare Aug.* ¦ *[i]ter. cum ab eo evocato*¦
> *[i]n Britannia militasse* ¦ *[c]ol Pia Flavia Constans*¦
> *Emerita Helvetiorum* ¦ *ex d.d.*

The text provides a number of facts. In the first place, his name, Gaius Iulius, indicates that one of his ancestors was probably enfranchised either by Iulius or Augustus, an inference confirmed by his membership in the Fabian tribe to which individual Helvetians were originally assigned[250]. Long standing possession of Roman citizenship would, in turn, imply membership in the old Gallic nobility[251]. Although his cognomen has the Roman spelling, his name is most likely a variant of the Celtic Camul-, of which a number of derivative forms are known[252].

Secondly, the text records that he was honoured as a sacerdos Augusti; whether he performed that capacity before or after his military service is uncertain, though probably the latter. He had served as a tribune of the soldiers for the Legio IIII Macedonica, which presumably at this time was stationed in Germany, and for some outstanding achievement was awarded a headless spear and a golden crown by Claudius himself. Having retired from active service, he was later called back by the same Emperor (ab eo) to join in the expedition to Britain. Again the text is not entirely clear, but it is possible that for his service in Britain he was once more (iterum) awarded the same ornamenta[253]. The inscription was set up by the colony of Aventicum which was established under Vespasian.

A broadly similar inscription was also set up in Camillus' honour by Julia Festilla, his daughter, a woman who maintained her family's tradition of leadership and service (CIL 13, 5094). She is elsewhere identified in an inscription found at Eborodunum, a town in the neighborhood of Aventicum, as flaminica prima Augusta vicina optima (CIL 13, 5064), the wife of C. Valerius Caburus who was also a member of the tribus Fabia (CIL 13, 5110); membership of this tribe indicates that, like the Iulii Camilli, he belonged to the long-enfranchised nobility of the Helvetii. For reasons not stated, the states of the Aedui and the Helvetii honoured Valerius Camillus with a public funeral and the Helvetii decreed statues for him. If he had, in fact, served in some military capacity, it is possible that, like his father-in-law, who was called out of retirement, he too may have served in the British campaign.

In Claudius' own mind, the conquest of Britain was his crowning achievement, an event which, he thought, would perpetuate his memory. He was proud enough to bestow the name Britannicus on his infant son and grateful enough to reward generously those involved in the campaign, if mostly members of the higher ranks. No doubt, he was conscious of the role which Gaul as a whole played in the expedition, both in the thousands of troops which it provided and in its position as a supply base[254]. Claudius, therefore, erected two triumphal arches for the conquest, one in Rome and one in Gaul, since that was the springboard from which he launched an invasion of Britain (CD 60.22,1).

(T.?) Domitius Decidius

In A.D. 44, among those becoming consuls was Cn. Hosidius Geta who had received ornamenta triumphalia for his help in the expedition without yet having been consul (CD 60.20,4). Another was P. Calvisius Sabinus Pomponius Secundus, who was the brother of the rebel, Q. Pomponius Secundus and half-brother of the presently disgraced Cn. Domitius Corbulo. It was during this year that Claudius decided to restore to the quaestors the finances of the Treasury which had, against the old custom, fallen into the hands of the praetors (CD. 60.24,1-2). The quaestors were now to be appointed for a three year term, the object being to develop a more cohesive and consistent financial policy. Tacitus makes reference to the policy when he writes: *Tunc Claudius quaestores rursum imposuit, iisque, ne metu offensionum segnius consulerent, extra ordinem honores promisit* (Tac., *Ann*. 13.29). Among the first men to be appointed for this duty was a Gaul named (T.?). Domitius Decidius whose inscription (*CIL* 6,1403) reads as follows:

> [T.Do]*mitio* *T.f.* *Vol.* *Decidio* ¦ [iii] *viro* *capitali*[elect]*o* *a* *Ti.* *Claudio* *Caesare* ¦ [Augus]*to* *Germanico* *qui* *primus* ¦ [quaes]*tor* *per* *triennium* *citra* ¦ [sorte]*m* *praeesset* *aerario* *Saturni* ¦ *praetori*

According to the text, Domitius Decidius first served as a *triumvir capitalis*, that is in charge of executions, before being chosen by Claudius to take over the management of the *aerarium Saturni*. He was appointed *citra sortem* which means that the normal lot was waived for this post[255]. On completion of his three-year term, from 44-47[256], this man, without having served as aedile, was immediately promoted to the office of praetor, a point which Tacitus makes when he states: *extra ordinem honores promisit* (*Ann*. 13.29).

Domitius Decidius is assumed to have been Narbonese because of his *nomen* and his membership in the *tribus*

Voltinia. Furthermore, he appears to be the father of Domitia Decidiana, splendidis natalibus orta, who later became the wife of the Narbonese senator, Cn. Iulius Agricola (Tac. Agr. 6). Burnand strongly believes that Domitius Decidius was of Viennese origin[257] and would connect him both to Sex. Decidius (CIL 12, 2324) who was from Vienna and to a procurator in Spain, T. Decidius Domitianus, whose right-hand man was a Viennese notable named T. Pompeius Albinus (AE, 1935, 5). These associations are insufficient in themselves to prove that Domitius Decidius was from Vienna, that is from the same town as Asiaticus and perhaps that of Corbulo, though the possibility deserves some consideration.

P. Clodius Quirinalis

Another Gaul who reportedly was flourishing in Rome during this year was P. Clodius Quirinalis of Arelate. Noted for the year 43-44, only by Hieronymus (Chron. 205.4), he was an orator who was teaching rhetoric at Rome with great distinction (insignissime)[258]. His fate or whereabouts thereafter are unknown, but while he was in Rome, he must have come into contact with Domitius Afer, a fellow Narbonensian who was at that time considered one of Rome's pre-eminent lawyers and orators (Quint., Inst. 10. 1,118).

M. Pompeius Silvanus Staberius Flavinus

In A.D. 45, one of those chosen consul ordinarius was

M. Vinicius, a man who had already once been consul, was married to Julia the sister of Caligula and had initially been one of those proposed as a successor to Caligula after his overthrow. (This circumstance becomes more relevant in the following year when the other pretender, Valerius Asiaticus became consul ordinarius.) Another well-connected consul for that year (March-June), Ti. Plautius Silvanus Aelianus, was, by virture of his blood relationship to the Aelii and his adoption into the Plautii[259], related to two of Claudius' former wives, Aelia Paetina and Plautia Urgulanilla. But one consul suffectus for that year who had absolutely no relationship to the imperial family was M. Pompeius Silvanus Staberius Flavinus. Although his nomen, Pompeius, is relatively common in Narbonensis, the suspicion that he was Narbonese was only confirmed after W. Eck reconstructed an inscription to Silvanus found at Arelate (AE, 1952, 168; AE, 1953, 42)[260]. Of Pompeius Silvanus' background before his first consulship, more particularly whether he belonged originally to a senatorial or equestrian family, nothing is certain. One would suppose that, since he became consul in A.D. 45, he had probably begun his senatorial career at least fifteen to twenty years earlier, which, in turn, would indicate that he was already a senator during the time of Tiberius. Pflaum, however, doubts that Arelate "sheltered" a family of senatorial rank as early as ca. A.D. 20[261] and hence the implication is that he began his senatorial career much later and was then speedily promoted either because of his own personal influence (on the model of Valerius Asiaticus) or through the importance of his friends, an advantage enjoyed by Q. Curtius Rufus (Tac., Ann. 9.20).

D. Valerius Asiaticus

In the following year, Valerius Asiaticus, formerly consul suffectus for A.D. 35 and perhaps one of those honoured with ornamenta triumphalia for his work in Britain, reached the pinnacle of the senatorial cursus by becoming consul ordinarius. Presumably he received this honour either because of the British expedition, as was the case with Cn. Hosidius Geta in A.D. 44 and later with Vespasian in A.D. 51, or conceivably, like M. Vinicius in A.D. 45, as payment for laying aside any claim to the principate after the overthrow of Caligula. It was probably no coincidence that Asiaticus' colleague for that year, M. Iunius Silanus, the brother of Caligula's first wife, Iunia Claudilla, also bore a fierce resentment against the previous regime. His father had been forced to commit suicide by Caligula, who was covetous of his one-time father-in-law's property (Tac., Agr. 4; Suet., Calig. 23).

Dio is the only commentator who discusses Asiaticus' actual consulship in A.D. 46 (CD. 60. 27, 1-5). He says that although Asiaticus had been elected for the whole year, he resigned his post after only two months[262]. Dio explains that Asiaticus perceived a great amount of jealousy building up against him, because of both his wealth and now his second consulship. In an effort to curtail this hatred and perhaps make himself less conspicuous (and therefore less susceptible to accusation) he relinquished his office. While Dio's explanation, taken at face value, is possible, the idea that Asiaticus resigned because many were envious of his second consulship is strange[263], particularly when one considers that the consules ordinarii for the two previous years, C. Sallustius Passienus Crispus in A.D. 44 and M. Vinicius in A.D. 45, were also bis consules[264]. These men apparently aroused no jealously and while admittedly, they had both been married to sisters of Gaius, and were thereby members of the Imperial family, Asiaticus himself (or technically, at least, his wife Lollia Saturnina) was, for a short time, related as an in-law to that Emperor as well.

If it is an unacceptable or at least unlikely idea that many were envious of Asiaticus simply because he was honoured with a second consulship, perhaps a modification of Dio's explanation is in order. In the first place, jealousy would imply that a rivalry or hatred existed between one party and Asiaticus before he reached his second consulship. What caused this feud we do not know, though it is possible it arose after Asiaticus defeated some candidate, who resented losing to a native provincial; it is also possible that he was hated by a pro-Caligula faction which considered him the main instigator in the overthrow. For whatever reason, then, this opposing faction will have considered Asiaticus' new consulship not so much an occasion for jealousy and hatred, which was already there, as a source of annoyance; in other words they were watching a rival gain yet another feather for his cap. If this faction was initially annoyed, it must have been furious when he resigned his post after only two months. For while his name was maintained as one of the two principal consuls for that year, now he had no need to furnish the requisite games which the consules ordinarii usually offered (CD 60.27,2). In other words, Asiaticus, a very wealthy man who could easily afford such games, received the maximum honour for a minimum cost.

Whatever the expense he saved by resigning, Asiaticus paid dearly in the following year, A.D. 47, when he was put on trial before Claudius. An account of the proceedings is found in both Tacitus (Ann. 11, 1-3) and Dio (60.29, 5-6); as one would expect, there are discrepancies in each version. In Tacitus' account, Messalina was the principal instigator of the trial, her motive apparently being to get rid of Asiaticus and then confiscate the gardens of Lucullus, which Asiaticus owned. To achieve her goal, Messalina first conscripted P. Suillius Rufus, who was, among other things, a half-brother of Domitius Corbulo. Also added to this cabal was Britannicus' tutor, Sosibius, whose task it was to warn Claudius about Asiaticus. Emphasizing the hostile resources of Asiaticus (vim et opes principibus infensas, Tac., Ann. 9.1), Sosibius went on to remind the Emperor that this senator from Gaul had been the chief instigator in the assassination of Caligula and had even admitted his involvement in an assembly of the Roman people. Sosibius further implied that the same scenario could be repeated, particularly in light of Asiaticus' fame both in the city and throughout the provinces and his connections in his homeland, where he had a real ability to stir up trouble[265]. His intended trip to the Germanic armies only helped to make Asiaticus look more suspicious. On hearing this, Claudius needed no more advice but promptly ordered the praetorian prefect, Crispinus, to arrest Asiaticus and bring him to Rome.

Although the Senate was normally responsible for trying its members, at this inquiry, the Senate was not even allowed access. Instead the trial was held in Claudius' bedroom, with only a small number in attendance. Apparently those behind the arrest feared the publicity a trial would entail, realizing that Asiaticus' popularity both in the Senate and the Germanic armies could only be detrimental to their cause and, more importantly, to the security of the whole Empire. Although Sosibius implied in his statement to Claudius that Asiaticus had the potential and perhaps intention to overthrow the regime, he was never actually charged with treason or conspiracy to do so. Instead, P. Suillius Rufus read out the list of accusations; Asiaticus had somehow corrupted the army which was obliged to pay him money; he was privy to unidentified *stuprum*; that he had committed adultery with Poppaea Sabina, who was the wife of a Scipio; and he was guilty of homosexual acts. Asiaticus reportedly restrained himself until the last charge, which he vehemently rebutted with the words, *Interroga, Suilli, filios tuos: virum esse me fatebuntur* (*Ann*. 11.2).

Asiaticus spoke eloquently in his own defense, enough not only to move Claudius but even enough to move Messalina to tears. (She left the room to wipe away the tears but not before warning L. Vitellius, Claudius' consular colleague for that year, not to let the prisoner "slip out", [*elabi*]). After Asiaticus' speech, Claudius asked what Vitellius thought about acquitting the defendant. Vitellius answered by recalling the long friendship both he and Asiaticus had shared, how both were equally devoted to the Emperor's mother, Antonia, and to the state which Asiaticus had served both in Rome and recently in Britain. He then concluded that on the basis of these qualities Asiaticus should be allowed to choose his own manner of execution. Without any concern for Asiaticus' guilt or the logic of Vitellius' argument[266], Claudius agreed to his proposal *in eandem clementiam* (Tac. *Ann*. 11.3).

Asiaticus put up no resistence to what we would nowadays call a "kangaroo court". He declined the advice of friends who recommended that he starve himself to death. Instead, he carried out his normal routine, exercising, bathing and then dining, all in good spirits. He remarked at dinner how much more honourable it would have been to die by the cunning ingenuity (calliditas) of Tiberius or the sheer violence (impetus) of Caligula, than to die because of the deceit of a woman (Messalina) and the shameless tongue of Vitellius. Thereafter, he examined his pyre to see that all was in order and then cut his wrists. Tacitus comments on Asiaticus' laudible composure right to the end[267].

Dio's account of Asiaticus' trial, while far less detailed than that of Tacitus', includes some radical differences from that found in the Annals (CD. 60.29, 4-60). He says that Claudius was aware that certain individuals were conspiring against him but the Emperor disregarded their threat, saying confidently, "It doesn't do to take the same measures against a flea as against a wild beast"[268]. Asiaticus, must, nevertheless, have been viewed as a wild beast since he was put on trial. Asiaticus denied the charges against himself and disavowed any knowledge of or acquaintance with those testifying against him. A soldier who claimed to be a collaborator in Asiaticus' conspiracy was not even able to identify him. Apparently, Asiaticus was bald but this soldier pointed, by mistake to another bald man who was present at the trial, thereby causing the others in attendance to break out in laughter. Claudius was on the verge of acquitting Asiaticus when Vitellius, in collusion with

Messalina who had brought up the false charges, stated that Asiaticus had sent for him so as to choose his manner of execution. At that, Claudius assumed Asiaticus had convicted himself and promptly had him executed.

Such, then, are the two versions of the trial and execution of the man whom Garzetti referred to as one of Claudius' "most illustrious victims"[269]. As is evident, each historian recounts details which the other either knowingly omitted as irrelevant or of which he was totally unaware. Dio, for instance, does not mention such details as the location or secrecy of the trial, the role of Suillius Rufus or Sosibius, the charges of adultery and stuprum or the manner of execution by which Asiaticus died. Tacitus' version excludes any reference to the soldiers who actually testified against Asiaticus, especially the one who claimed to be privy to Asiaticus' designs but was unable to identify him in the same room. Both authors agree, more or less, on the collusion of Messalina and L. Vitellius and on the fact that it was largely because of Vitellius that Claudius was persuaded to convict Asiaticus.

Of all the details presented, Scramuzza has difficulty with the veracity of two in particular. First, he sees a parallel between Messalina, who brought false charges against Asiaticus in order to acquire his Lucullan Gardens and Agrippina, who did the same against Statilius Taurus so as to take possession of his property[270]. He says the similarities of both stories make each look less credible. If Scramuzza is right, one might conceivably argue that since Messalina acquired the gardens after Asiaticus died (Tac., Ann. 11, 32), people assumed later that that had been her intent all along, even though her real reason for involvement may have been quite different[271]

Second, he finds the involvement of L. Vitellius in the whole affair almost unbelievable[272]. Vitellius remarks that he and Asiaticus had a long-standing friendship and that both belonged to the entourage of Claudius' mother, Antonia (Tac., Ann. 11.3). Scramuzza adds that "There is no serious reason for doubting the sincerity of (Vitellius') grief over the forthcoming fate of Asiaticus". Moreover both families remained good friends thereafter, Asiaticus' son supporting Vitellius' son, Aulus, in his bid for the principate in A.D. 68-69. In other words, although Scramuzza does not actually say so, this portrayal of Vitellius as a "despicable trickster"[273] may well be the result of a deliberate, perhaps Flavian, smear campaign directed against the Vitellian family after the fall of the Emperor Vitellius.

One problem which Scramuzza does not address and which may, in fact, support his suspicions about Messalina's alleged motives and Vitellius' role in the trial and execution of Asiaticus, is the fact that neither Tacitus nor Dio mentions a source. No official record of the proceedings (assuming, of course, any existed since it was not a real trial) would have presented the Empress or one of the consuls in so bad a light. As that would have been the only contemporary record, any elaboration would consequently have to derive from hearsay and rumor, sources which can often be true but which must also be handled carefully.

To conclude this episode, the basic facts of the trial and execution of the principal senator from Gaul reduce to the following: (1) Asiaticus was consul ordinarius for A.D. 46; (2) he gained many enemies in the Senate out of hatred and jealousy (a likely possibility given the general atmosphere of the times), and (3) he was killed the following year, no doubt by order of the Emperor for reasons not exactly clear. While Messalina and L. Vitellius may have been involved, together with P. Suillius Rufus and Sosibius, it is also true that others - Asiaticus' "many enemies" - may have also had a hand in the plot to get him permanently removed. These individuals, however, managed to keep their involvement low-key and their reputations unblemished.

Cn. Domitius Corbulo

Also in that year, A.D. 47, Domitius Corbulo, the half-brother of Suillius Rufus, re-emerged from the disgrace he had incurred during the reign of Caligula to become the legate of the Lower German armies (Tac., Ann. 11.18). His tenure there was short but eventful, for Tacitus writes that the glory which he later achieved began with this military command.

First, he successfully expelled Gannascus and his piratical band of Chauci from Lower Germany, then he sought to restore strict order and discipline in the legions stationed there. Immediately after this, he imposed on the Frisii, who were at this time wavering in their loyalty to Rome, a Roman- style constitution, marked by a senate, magistracies and written laws. In what turned out to be a serious mistake, he dispatched assassins to kill the renagade Gannascus, an act which enraged the Chauci and brought them to the brink of war. Although Corbulo was prepared for this possibility, Claudius ordered him to retreat. Apparently, Claudius was advised (by unidentified persons) that a war would bring him no advantage (Tac., Ann. 11.19). If Corbulo won, he would receive the credit in the eyes of the soldiers and the people and would, then, become a threat to the security of the throne. If Corbulo lost, the blame would probably fall on the Emperor since he alone had the power to stop a legate's offensive. His preparations then halted, Corbulo was reported to have issued the statement beatos quondam duces Romanos, implying, of course, that in days past there were no emperors to restrain Roman generals. Before ending his tenure (of undetermined length), Corbulo's last major accomplishment in Lower Germany was the construction of a canal, later called the fossa Corbulonis, between the Meuse and Rhine rivers. For all Corbulo's works, as if to compensate him for the loss of a potential victory against the Chauci, Claudius awarded him triumphal honours. If we accept the idea that his family was Narbonese, then with his recent honour and the death of Asiaticus earlier that year, Corbulo will now have been the principal senator from Gallia Narbonensis.

Q. Curtius Rufus

While Corbulo was in command of the Lower German army, the army of Upper Germany was under the charge of yet another individual who may have been Narbonese, Q. Curtius Rufus (Ann. XI.20) Consul in A.D. 43, he seems to have succeeded Vibius Rufinus as governor in A.D. 45 and to have continued in the post until P. Pomponius Secundus, another of Corbulo's half-brothers, assumed command in A.D. 50. In A.D. 47 or perhaps the year after, Rufus, as if in emulation of Corbulo[274], was also awarded with triumphal insignia, though for an odd, entirely non-military reason. Claudius honoured Rufus because he had opened a silver mine, employing his own soldiers as cheap labour. After little return and much exhaustion, the soldiers secretly wrote a letter to the Emperor, asking him to give triumphal honours beforehand to any newly-appointed governor so that he would not have to exhaust the soldiers' energy in trying to win them.

The Downfall of Messalina

In the autumn of that same eventful year, so Tacitus reports, Messalina brazenly celebrated a marriage with the young senator, C. Silius (Ann. 11.26 f.; and Suet., Claud. 26). The Emperor had been informed of this marriage, which was itself tantamount to treason, by his freedmen, who now feared that Messalina was out of their control. As much for her blatant disloyalty as for her poor judgement, Messalina and her husband were ordered executed.

The relevance of this event to Gallic-Imperial relations is unclear. Messalina had reportedly been instrumental in securing the death of the principal senator from Gaul, Valerius Asiaticus earlier that year; so it was appropriate that she was killed at the Gardens of Lucullus which had previously belonged to him but which she had acquired after his death. However, Tacitus does not say that any of her past activities, notably complicity in the death of Asiaticus, had anything to do with the procurators' attempt to oust her. By stating that the marriage was their only motivation, Tacitus is almost implying that they approved of her involvement in Asiaticus' death or that, at the very least, it was no concern of theirs.

Saufeius Trogus

One apparently Gallic name does emerge in the narrative of Messalina's last days. Tacitus writes that among those executed for complicity in the marriage-conspiracy was a certain enigmatic Saufeius Trogus (Ann. 11.3.1). This cognomen, found once with the historian Pompeius Trogus, is irrefutably Celtic and is restricted exclusively to Gaul proper. He may, of course, have been a collateral descendant of the historian. Seneca groups him together with a number of Roman knights and although Eden, for instance, is cautious about the attribution, Trogus was probably also equestrian[275].

The Decree of Claudius

In A.D. 48, when Claudius assumed the previously moribund post of censor, it was decided that Gauls from Tres Galliae should be permitted to enrol in the senatorial order and seek offices in the city of Rome. As a decree, the so-called ius adipiscendorum honorum was a milestone in the Romanization of all Gaul[276]; as a statement of social policy, it marked an abrupt change in at least the official attitude of the Roman government toward its often restless subjects in Tres Galliae.

There are two sources for this event, Tacitus (Ann. 11.23-25) and the Emperor Claudius himself, whose speech to the Senate is preserved on a bronze table at Lyon (CIL 13, 1668). Because the two versions of the actual speech are sometimes at variance with one another, the great body of research on this topic has largely concerned itself with historiographical problems, especially regarding Tacitus' changes in Claudius' own wording. Scholars are divided as to whether Tacitus improved on Claudius speech by ignoring some of the irrelevancies and clarifying the logic or if he distorted an already well-organized speech in order to present the Emperor in as negative a light as possible. As a result, there are two schools of thought which alternately consider Claudius' own words to be "rambling and clear, irrelevant and logical, wearisome and to the point"[277]. Wellesley, representing the latter school, writes, "A careful study,then, of the Tacitean speech convinces us increasingly of its futility and artificiality: a careful study of Claudius' speech largely disposes of the charges so long, so irresponsibly, so unjustly levelled against it[278]. In contrast to Wellesley, N.P. Miller asserts that "Tacitus has produced a sound example of an inverted speech and one which does not misrepresent the spirit of the original"[279].

While both speeches, admittedly, contain parallels and differences, more important for the question of Gallic promotion in Roman society are the historical and prosopographical data which each text reveals. First, on the historical side, it is implied in both speeches that the idea of permitting Gauls to apply for senatorial rank arose because a delegation arrived in Rome to petition it. Tacitus writes: *primores Galliae ... ius adipiscendorum in urbe honorum expeterunt* (*Ann*. 11.23), while Claudius' speech includes the remark *tot ecce insignes iuvenes, quot intueor, non magis sunt paenitendi senatores quam ...*. The identity of this delegation is never made clear and hence has been the object of widely differing speculation. Wellesley, for instance, holds that is was probably composed of Gauls from Tres Galliae and dispatched after the annual meeting, the concilium Galliarum, on August 1,48[280]. Griffin, however, argues that the insignes iuvenes, whom Claudius mentions as standing before him, were in fact, already senators and most likely from Narbonensis[281]. In other words, if this assumption were true, the Gallic senators, now presumably under the leadership of Corbulo and Domitius Afer, would be lobbying on behalf of their kindred to the north.

A second historical point is that after the proposal was made, it ran into significant opposition in the senate. Tacitus writes that the senators feared large numbers of wealthy Gallic dynasts, descendants of the enemies of the divine Iulius, would overwhelm the House and alter its essentially Italian character (Ann. 11.23)[282]. That this sentiment existed and was not simply a product of Tacitus' fertile imagination is proved by Claudius' own inscribed words, in which the Emperor defends the long-standing Roman practice of absorbing her former enemies into the fold. What is perhaps also true is that after the Gauls were allowed access to the senate, resentment and fear still existed in the hearts of those same Italian senators. The fact that so few Gauls, apparently, were adlected after this decree (see below p. 201 f.) may argue for the possibility that a deal was struck between the lobby proposing the decree and those opposed, whereby those opposed would support the move provided that there would not be any wholesale admission of those Gauls whose wealth met the property qualification. In that way, some Gauls, perhaps around twenty, could be admitted thereby appeasing Gallic ambitions, without disturbing Italian control of the chamber to any degree.

A third matter reported by Tacitus is that after the decree was passed, it was decided that the Aedui would be the first to receive senatorial rights since, along with placation, they had both been the first to strike a treaty with Rome in Gaul (besides Massilia) and alone enjoyed the privilege of being called brothers of the Roman people (Ann. 11.25). From this privilege one might conclude that the Aedui were the leading instigators of the move either as part of the official delegation from Tres Galliae or as a tribe which had actively sought the intercession of Narbonese senators. Strangely enough, however, none of the senators who have been identified or proposed as beneficiaries of this decree were Aeduan[283]. Perhaps, however, this only reflects our fragmentary information since it would be peculiar - in fact, a grave insult - if Claudius did not act upon so well-publicized a promise to so a loyal an ally as the Aedui.

L. Iulius Vestinus

Claudius' own speech is prosopographically more valuable than Tacitus' version. In it, Claudius states that it was from the "most adorned and most flourishing colony of Vienna" that one of his closest procurators, L. (Iulius) Vestinus, *inter paucos equestris ordinis ornamentum*, originated. Claudius does not reveal how long this man had been in the imperial service, though one might expect he had already been in office for a long time since he clearly had earned not only Claudius' full confidence, but even his friendship (*familiarissime diligo*). L. Vestinus is not mentioned thereafter in the reign of Claudius, but he re-emerges in A.D. 59 to become Prefect of Egypt, a post which was considered the pinnacle of the equestrian cursus and which he held until around A.D. 62[284]. Surviving through the reign of Nero and the tumultuous year which followed, he was asked by the newly-installed emperor, Vespasian, to take over the reconstruction of the Capitol in A.D. 70. (Tac., *Hist*. 4.53).

M. (Iulius) Vestinus Atticus

Claudius also refers to the children of this L. Vestinus, though without actually naming them, and insists that they too, like their father, deserve further promotion. Already serving in some unidentified priesthoods, the sons were assured by the Emperor of further increases to their *dignitas*. One of those usually identified as a son of the procurator Vestinus is M. (Iulius) Vestinus Atticus, the consul for A.D. 65. Described as *violentus et infensus* to the Pisonian conspirators (*Ann*. 15.68) and married to the noble Statilia Messalina, he was eventually ordered by Nero to commit suicide ostensibly because of his alleged involvement in the Pisonian conspiracy, though more likely so that Nero could marry Vestinus' wife.

D. Valerius Asiaticus

In a further reference to Vienna, Claudius mentions but again without naming, his erstwhile friend, Valerius Asiaticus:

> *ut dirum illud nomen latronis taceam et odi illud palaestricum prodigium quod ante in domum consulatum intulit quam colonia sua solidum civitatis Romanae beneficium consecuta est*.
>
> (*CIL* 13, 1668, col. ii)

This fierce, indeed personal, attack against Asiaticus (which Griffin praises Tacitus for omitting[285]) does not explain why Asiaticus was executed. Claudius does mention that the senator had been elected consul even though his city, Vienna, had not yet received full Roman rights, though that would hardly justify an execution. Reference to the other charges, however, such as conspiracy and *stupra* are totally absent. Scramuzza observes in this regard, "If Asiaticus ... was tried for treason, the imperial tirade had some justification but we must yet explain how the Emperor's rage could be kept at the boiling point for a whole year, if the man had been guilty of nothing more than a breach of morals"[286]. Claudius' hatred (*odi*) of this Gaul is best demonstrated by his refusal to name him. Wellesley suggests Claudius did not mention Asiaticus by name lest those senators involved in the conspiracy become apprehensive[287], but it seems more likely that he refused to name him because he had imposed an unofficial condemnation of Asiaticus' memory. His omission of the dead man's name together with the irrelevancy of the other statements (... *illud palaestricum prodigium*) indicate Claudius had developed a hatred of Asiaticus that was basically irrational but which resulted from what he perceived to be (or had been persuaded to be) betrayal by his one-time friend.

Interestingly, Claudius appears to have directed this hatred solely at Asiaticus, for he remarks how he pities Asiaticus' brother who, because of some unspecified misfortune (presumably a loss of property), cannot serve as a senator. The fate (or even the full name) of this brother is uncertain. Syme takes Claudius' words (*idem de eius fratre possum dicere*) to mean that Asiaticus' brother also served as consul sometime between A.D. 36-45[288].

While Asiaticus and his brother are referred to only obliquely, they are, nonetheless, the sole Gauls of senatorial class whose identities are even hinted at in either Claudius' own speech or Tacitus' version of it. The Narbonese senators are mentioned generically both by Claudius (*solum ipsum ultra fines provinciae Narbonensis iam vobis senatores mittere*) and Tacitus (*Num paenitet Balbos ex Hispania nec minus insignis viros e Gallia Narbonensi transivisse*[289] *Ann*. 11.24) though none of these "*insignis viros*" (i.e., Domitius Afer, Domitius

Decidius, Corbulo) was specifically named. Why he refrained from giving the names of any of the senators though he did name the equestrian L. Vestinus (not to mention his senatorial friend Paullus Fabius Persicus Allobrogicus) is debatable. Perhaps Claudius realised that to mention specifically some prominent Gauls might lead Italian senators to think that he had been unduly influenced by those individuals. That could be detrimental to his cause since Afer, Corbulo and others had enjoyed spotted careers up to that time and had made enemies in the process. Those enemies would, in turn, have been suspicious of any initiative on the part of Afer or Corbulo and might have been prepared to do just about anything to obstruct the motion, particularly if they thought it would make the Narbonese senators more powerful. It would, therefore, have been in Claudius' interest, assuming he really wanted senators from Gallia Comata, to present the motion as his own initiative and refrain from mentioning any Narbonese senators who may have coaxed him toward that idea.

Iulius Vindex

Just as Tacitus refrains from naming any of the Narbonese senators who may have been involved or instrumental in securing the decree, so too is he silent about the identity of the nobles from Tres Galliae who were subsequently adlected. In spite of this vacuum of information, scholars have attempted to single out Gauls who benefitted from the new law either immediately or shortly after it was enacted. Five individuals have been proposed, all of whom bear the name Iulius. Among possible candidates, the most notable to have been suggested is the father of Iulius Vindex, who probably bore the same name. Dio writes that the younger Vindex, who served as legate of Gallia Lugdunensis in A.D. 68, was a descendant of Aquitanian kings and that, "by virtue of his father's position", was a Roman senator (CD 63.22,1). This brief, inexplicit detail of Dio's description of Vindex' background has left modern scholars cautious in making any definitive pronouncements on the question; those who do say anything seem to hold widely divergent views. Hainsworth, for instance, states that Vindex's family was presumably enrolled into the senatorial order under Claudius though he refrains from assigning any date to the admission[290]. Syme, on the other hand, suggests that it is possible that Vindex' father had already been a senator before Claudius' censorship[291]. Exceptions to rules are always possible, though this latter suggestion seems rather bold. If there were Gauls from Aquitania already in the Senate, Claudius (or Tacitus) would surely have said so; the Emperor does mention, in fact, that there were already senators present from Lugdunum, a colony of Tres Galliae which had far more privileges than other centres of that region[292]. Wightman, finally, maintains that it was the younger Vindex himself, the governor of Lugdunensis, who was admitted into the senate at that time[293], a proposal which simply ignores Dio's statement that Vindex' position as a senator resulted from that of his father.

It is perfectly plausible, then, that Vindex' father was one of the early senators from Tres Galliae and that he entered the _curia_ probably in A.D. 48 or not long afterwards. As for his own background, while Dio says that he was a descendent of Aquitanian kings, this probably does not mean that he originated specifically from the Aquitani, who were a Basque-speaking people; the name _Vindex_ appears to be rather the Romanized form of a Celtic name _Vindus_[294]. Certainly, his son could hardly have enjoyed the support he did from Celtic Gaul if he were not from a Celtic tribe himself. If we consider that he came from such a tribe in Aquitania which had a regal, as opposed to a republican, form of government, the best choice for his place of origin would be among the Arverni or perhaps from one of the smaller satellites of that powerful state. Whatever the case, the elder Vindex, after his admission to the senate, does not appear to have been particularly influential. Contrary to the fears of the Italian senators, his career did not upset the senatorial balance (not at least to any degree worth historical mention) and, had it not been for his son's rebellion in A.D. 68, his existence might never have been even conjectured.

M. Aper

A second name to have been proposed as one of the adlected senators from Tres Galliae is that of M. Aper, whom we have mentioned above (p.175) with regard to the campaign in Britain. Originating from Tres Galliae (Tac., Dial. 7), he seems to have been a senator by the mid first century[295], a period which corresponds exactly to Claudius' decree of A.D. 48. In fact, Tacitus may hint at this when Aper states ... non eum diem laetiorem egi quo mihi latus clavus oblatus est, vel quo homo novus et in civitate minime favoribili natus ... The reference to his origins in "a state hardly popular" may indicate that although the decree allowing Gauls into the Senate was passed, there was still opposition and resentment to the idea on the part of many of the Italians. Despite this obstacle, Aper eventually reached the office of praetor (Tac., Dial. 7); by the time of the Flavians, both he and his fellow Gaul, Iulius Secundus, were considered "the most celebrated minds of the Roman forum" (ibid. 2).

Iulius Africanus

A third Gaul who may have been adlected shortly after A.D. 48 is the orator, Iulius Africanus. Born sometime around the birth of Christ[296], he was probably the son of the Santonian noble of the same name who was implicated in the conspiracy of Sejanus in A.D. 31 (Tac., Ann. 6.7 and cf. p. 105). Although it is nowhere stated that he was actually a senator, there are two references, both in Quintilian, which may point in that direction. In the first, Quintilian says that of the most skilful speakers in Rome, Africanus and his fellow Gaul, Domitius Afer, were longe praestantissimi (Inst. 10.1, 18). In other words, Quintilian is saying that Africanus was a prominent member of a profession whose elite members were, like his colleague, Domitius Afer, senatorial. There are exceptions admittedly to this rule but they are few. In the second passage, Quintilian writes that on the death of Agrippina in A.D. 59, Africanus addressed Nero saying, Rogant te, Caesar, Galliae tuae, ut felicitatem tuam fortiter feras (Inst. 8.5, 15). Quintilian does not state in what capacity Africanus was speaking when he made that remark. One way to explain Galliae tuae would be to suppose that he was acting as a representative of the concilium Galliarum. But another explanation could be that he spoke as one of the principal senators from Tres Galliae. Tacitus comments that after the death of Agrippina, the senate showered accolades on Nero and curses on his now-deceased mother (Ann. 14.12). It seems perfectly possible, therefore, that Africanus' timely remark was made on the senate floor and that Africanus, consequently, must have been senator.

M. Iulius Romulus

A fourth name in this list of five possible Senators from Tres Galliae is that of M. Iulius Romulus, who was definitely adlected by Claudius at this time and was more than likely a Gaul in the broad sense of the term. The question is whether he was from Narbonensis or Tres Galliae. He is only known from an inscription found at Velitrae, which reads:

> *M*. *Iulio* [,,,] *f*. *Vol.* *Romulo* *procos*
> *extra sortem provinciae Macedoniae*
> *legato pro pr. provinciae Cypri pro. praef.*
> *frumenti dandi ex s.c. legato pro. pr*
> *iterum provinciae Asiae praetori*
> *legato divi Claudii leg. XV Apollinar*
> *adlecto trib. plebis a divo Claudio*
> *seviro equitum Romanor. equi. publ*(sic)
> *ic]um trib militum*
> (*AE*, 1925, 85),

This text has been interpreted in two widely different ways. Pflaum suggests that because of Romulus' impressive record of senatorial offices, he must have always belonged to the senatorial order and that his adlection to the post of *tribunus plebis* was not a promotion from the equestrian order but simply a means of bypassing the office of aedile so as to accelerate his career[297]; Pflaum takes this as proof of the favour which Claudius showered on this individual.

Groag, on the other hand, seems less convinced that Romulus was always a member of the senatorial class. "Si eum (i.e., Romulum) a Claudio in senatum adlectum ex ordine equestri esse ponimus neque in tribunicios quaestura omissa (adlectus tribunus plebis!) fortasse in eis Gallis fuit, quos Claudius anno 48 in senatum adlegit; multi enim Iulii praenomine M. tribu Voltinia usi in Gallia innotuerunt"[298]. In other words, he believes that M. Iulius Romulus was one of the adlected Gauls from Tres Galliae. His name, certainly, is typical of a Gallic origin in itself, though by no means exclusively Gallic, and while his tribal affiliation at first sights points rather toward Narbonensis as his origo[299], it must be remembered that the Santones were also assigned to tribus Voltinia. During the reign of Tiberius, the Santones were noted for such knights as Iulius Africanus, Iulius Rufus and Iulius Victor and under Claudius, the younger Africanus may also have become a senator. When one considers the prestige and influence some of these Santones enjoyed during previous reigns, the idea that there might be two contemporary senatorial candidates among them ca. A.D. 48 is by no means out of the question.

After Romulus had been adlected, he carried out a series of duties throughout the Empire, including (presumably in this order), legate of the Legion XV Apollinaris which was stationed at Carnuntum in Pannonia, legatus pro praetore first of Asia and later of Cyprus and finally proconsul of Macedonia. This final post he acquired extra sortem, which means that the normal lot was disregarded and Claudius simply appointed him there. At Rome, Romulus reached the magistracy of praetor and was later selected by a senatus consultum to take charge of the grain distribution in the city. Most, if not all, of these duties appear to have been carried out under the favouring hand of Claudius. It appears that Romulus' son of the same name also pursued a senatorial career, he is recorded in A.D. 69 as legatus pro praetore provinciae Sardiniae[300].

Q. Iulius Secundus

A final individual who may have been a Gallic senator is Q. Iulius Secundus, a legatus pro praetore whose name is found in an inscription at Tupusuctu in Mauretania (CIL 8, 8837). Regrettably, the text which dates from the year Nero and L. Antistius Vetus served as consuls in A.D. 55, does not indicate where Secundus served as legatus; Mauretania itself might be a likely choice in view of the find-spot but Baetica, separated from Mauretania by the Straits of Gibraltar, has been proposed as well[301].

The proposal that Secundus was Gallic is based on his name, Q. Iulius Secundus, and his tribal affiliation, which the Tupusuctu inscription gives as Quirina. With regard to his name, Q. Iulius occurs passim throughout Tres Galliae while six instances of a Iulius Secundus exist in the same area, one of which, C. Iulius Secundus served as praetor at Burdigala (CIL 13, 596-600). Besides the epigraphical evidence, Tacitus mentions a Flavian orator from Gaul named Iulius Secundus who wrote a biography of Iulius Africanus (Dial. 14,4). His tribe, Quirina, is attested in various parts of Tres Galliae, especially among the Helvetii and the Petrocorii. While certainly an attractive possibility, the idea that this Q. Iulius Secundus was a Gaul is, nonetheless, impossible to prove. However tempting the combined evidence of name and tribe may be, it is not so distinctive (to borrow from Syme)[302] as to be conclusive.

These five men, then, the elder Iulius Vindex, Iulius Africanus, M. Iulius Romulus, Q. Iulius Secundus and M. (probably Iulius) Aper may have been the earliest beneficiaries of Claudius' decree. If they were, one can assume they were of roughly the same background, that is descendants of Gallic nobles who had been enfranchised by either Iulius Caesar or Augustus. It is doubtful that these were the only Gauls who were admitted around this time. Into a total senate of between four-hundred and six-hundred men, Claudius could have easily admitted fifteen to twenty such Gauls without causing any consternation about Italy's control of the chamber. Given the internal politics in Gaul, he was no doubt expected to appoint at least one from each of the federate states (i.e., the Aedui, Remi, Lingones and Carnutes) and perhaps at least one from the most important "free" states (i.e., the Arverni, Santones, Bituriges, Segusiavi, etc.). Anything less could be an insult to a state not so honoured. One would expect that all those members of the delegation which sought the privilege must have been adlected for the same reason. Likewise, those men who had served in the annual post of high-priest of Roma and Augustus, the highest honour to which a Romanized-Gaul could have aspired before A.D. 48, would have assuredly be given preference in selection for senatorial promotion.

Pompeius Paulinus

In addition to those adlected from Tres Galliae, many were probably admitted to the Senate at this time from the older province of Narbonensis. Among those senators whose names first emerge historically in the later years of Claudius or early in the reign of Nero (and hence may have entered the senate at around this time) is Pompeius Paulinus from Arelate, suffect consul ca. A.D. 54/55. At approximately the same time as Claudius' censorship, Paulinus' father, also Pompeius Paulinus, held the important equestrian post of *praefectus annonae* (Sen. *Dial* 10.18,3), in which he managed the city grain supply. That he was not only from Arelate, a colony with full Roman rights, but even a descendant of native Gauls is revealed by a comment of the elder Pliny; *At, hercules, Pompeium Paulinum, Arelatensis equitis Romani filium paternaque gente pellitum, XII pondo argenti habuisse apud exercitum ferocissimis gentibus oppositum scimus* (*HN*. 33, 143).

The comment that Paulinus, an ex-consul and commander of a Roman legion, was "clothed in the skins of his father's race" is particularly striking. While he would not have worn such apparel in the Senate, he obviously felt more comfortable so attired in the field. Furthermore, it demonstrates that in spite of extensive Romanization in southern Gaul, many there were still attached to or even proud of their native culture and heritage.

Not much else is known about the elder Paulinus except that he was wealthy and earned the position of one of Claudius' most trusted procurators. Also on the model of L. Vestinus, Paulinus' son was appointed to the senate as a way of indirectly rewarding his father's loyal service. As mentioned above, the younger Paulinus became consul in 54/55. If he was made a senator in A.D. 48, it would appear that, like M. Iulius Romulus, he was admitted at a higher senatorial level in order to accelerate his career. In A.D. 56 two years after his service as consul, he was appointed legate of the Lower German army, a post once held by Domitius Corbulo and one which Paulinus himself would hold for two years. Four years after that in A.D. 62, Paulinus was chosen together with two other consulars, Lucius Piso and Ducenius Geminus, to supervise the *vectigalia publica*, an important financial post (Tac. *Ann*. 15,18).

L. Annaeus Seneca, Paulinus' brother-in-law

The identity of the younger Paulinus' mother or wife is not known. His sister, Paulina, however, married L. Annaeus Seneca, a Spaniard from Corduba (cf. PIR^2, "A", n. 617, p. 104) whose father had been the author of the oratorical work *Controversiae*. Like the Pompeii Paulini, Seneca had been born *equestri et provinciali loco* (Tac., *Ann*. 14.53), but was promoted to the senatorial order much earlier, perhaps late in the reign of Tiberius or early in that of Caligula (cf. Sen.

Helv. 19.2 and Dio 59.18.7). He followed his brother-in-law Paulinus to the consulship in either 55 or 56. The family connections he enjoyed in the Senate (both his brothers L. Annaeus Mela and L. Junius Gallio were senators), the provincial ties he shared with other Spaniards, and now his association by marriage with the Narbonese senatorial elite all combined to make his notice by Agrippina and eventual rise to power under Nero not only understandable but almost inevitable.

L. Duvius Avitus

Another Narbonensian who may have become a senator around this time is L. Duvius Avitus, who originated from Vasio of the Vocontii. The supposition that he comes from this town, arguably the home of the Tiberian senator, Abudius Ruso, is based on three inscriptions, the most important of which, although fragmentary, Pflaum has reconstructed[303] as follows,

> [- ¦ L(ucii) Du]*vii* *Avi*[t]*i* *co*[s(ulis)] ¦
> *uxor* ¦ [per]*petua* *fla*[min(ica) ¦ *cum* ¦
> fen]*estris qui ab inv*[adente ¦ cate]*rua*
> *funditus su(bversi* ¦ era]*nt de sua pecunia* ¦ [restituit].
> (*CIL* 12,1378)

This reconstruction is basically confirmed by the other two inscriptions at Vasio. One of them (*CIL* 12,1354) although anonymous, identifies the subject as *legatus pro praetore*, first of Aquitania and then of the army of Lower Germany; we have independent confirmation (cf. Pliny, *HN* 34,47) that Duvius held both these positions. The second inscription (*CIL*

12,1408) attests a certain L. Duvius Laurens, at Vasio thereby proving the existence of the rare nomen there[304]. The combination of this nomen with the praenomen, Lucius, further supports the idea that Duvius Avitus was Vasionese; cf. CIL 4,3340 where he is also attested as Lucius. Conceivably, L. Duvius Laurens was a freedman or a descendant of a freedman of the senator.

Pflaum argues that, when one considers Avitus' career, it is probable that he began as tribunus laticlavus[305] which would indicate he was already a member of the senatorial order; that, in turn, would counter the idea that he had been adlected in A.D. 48. As Pflaum admits, however, such a statement is unprovable since the stone which may record the career of Duvius Avitus (CIL 12,1354) is broken and allows us to trace his cursus only from the time he was praetor. According to the surviving text[306], he became praetor, then legatus pro praetore of the province of Aquitania; these posts he probably served under Claudius. In A.D. 56, he was appointed consul suffectus and two years later succeeded his fellow Narbonensian, Pompeius Paulinus, as commander of the army of Lower Germany. If we assume that Corbulo was also from Narbonensis, this would mean that from A.D. 47-58, there were three commanders of the Lower German army from that province. Avitus' greatest accomplishment in Germany was to deter an invasion of the Ampsivarii by a show of force on the part of both the Upper and Lower German armies (Tac., Ann.

13.56). (The Upper German army at this time was under the command of the enigmatic Curtilius Mancia (_ibid._), an individual who would eventually be connected by marriage to the Narbonese senator, Domitius Afer; Mancia's daughter married Afer's adopted son [Pliny, _Ep_. 8.18]). Sometime after his term in Germany, Avitus became an augur, an office which even at this time added further distinction to those already ennobled[307].

* * *

Just as with the individuals adlected from Tres Galliae, there were probably others from Narbonensis who entered the senate at this time whose names and careers are now lost to us. Why Claudius initiated the decree, later used as a precedent for admitting more exotic, though nonetheless Romanized, notables into the _curia_, is very debatable. One can argue that Claudius, like his uncle, Tiberius had a broader vision of the purpose of the Empire in that he wished to see _omnem florem ubique coloniarum et municipiorum, bonorum scilicet virorum et locupletium in hac curia_ (_CIL_ 12, 1668 col.ii) also _omnes Graecos, Gallos, Hispanos Britannos togatos_ (Sen. _Apoc_. 3.13). That goal, the total Romanization and hence in his own mind the civilization of the peoples of the Empire[308], must have assuredly been part of Claudius' plan in this regard, A more political, more cynical view of his motive which has sometimes been expressed is that Claudius intended to strip the Roman nobility of its control of the senate by admitting provincials more favourable to himself[309]. That charge could likewise be levelled at his uncle, Tiberius.

One aspect of this event which has not been much discussed is the influence which the Narbonensians in the court had on Claudius' decree. A great deal has been written, for instance, about the power now exercised by the freedmen, especially Narcissus, Pallas and Callistus but it should also be remembered that at the same time there were present in the Emperor's circle several influential Narbonensians, all of whom were descendants of native Gauls. Among the equestrians, the most prominent individual was the Viennese L. Vestinus who is mentioned in Claudius' speech as a man closely associated with the Emperor's affairs and was even one of the Emperor's friends (_Vestinum familiarissime diligo et hodieque in rebus meis detineo_, _CIL_ 13.1668, col.ii). A second procurator serving at the same time and no doubt at a similar level of influence was Sex. Afranius Burrus (_CIL_ 12, 5842); only three years afterwards, this native of Vasio was appointed sole praetorian prefect (see below p. 220 f.), certainly not a post for an administrative lightweight. Third, there was the Arelatan Pompeius Paulinus who, while "clothed in the skins of his father's race" served as prefect of the grain supply, a position vital to the well-being of the city.

The most important senators from Narbonensis in A.D. 48

were, like the above-named equestrians, Romanized descendants of native Gauls. Domitius Decidius, conceivably from Vienna, had only a few years before taken charge of the fiscal reorganization instituted by Claudius. Corbulo, perhaps also from Vienna, commanded one of the most important armies of the Empire, i.e., that of Lower Germany. Domitius Afer of Nemausus was by this time the principal advocate of the Roman forum. In other words, though not numerous, their influence far outweighed their voting strength.

Hardly, therefore, a group without power, all of these men, although Romanized, maintained contacts and perhaps even clients in Celtic Gaul, and may have served as mediators on the issue of senatorial rights between the chiefs of Tres Galliae and the Emperor himself. If so, it is likely enough that these chiefs, particularly those who directly benefitted from the decree in becoming Senators, owed much to the Emperor but developed an even greater loyalty towards those Narbonensians who had interceded on their behalf. A mutually-supportive relationship may well have arisen, therefore, between the senators of Narbonensis and Tres Galliae, whereby those from the latter provinces acquired senatorial status and, in return, offered their loyalty to the former group whose power steadily increased as a direct consequence.

C. Pompeius Longus Gallus

This improvement in the standing of the Narbonensians becomes even more evident in the years following the decree. In A.D. 49, for instance, one of the two consules ordinarii was a certain C. Pompeius Longus Gallus, whose name at least looks typically Narbonese - for which reason Syme suggests that he may have originated from that province[310]. While this may be true (other prominent Gallic Pompeii, for example Silvanus and Paulinus, were present in the senate at that time), it is difficult to be certain in the case of an individual whose background is so nebulous. As far as our records are concerned, he ascended to the top of the senatorial order from total obscurity and disappeared thereafter without a trace[311]. It is not even certain whether his full name as given above is correct; his praenomen is variously recorded as Gaius, Aulus or Gnaeus[312] while his cognomen, Longus, has a variant Longinus[313]. The only way one could be certain that this mysterious individual was Narbonese would be through the discovery of an honorific inscription which gave his tribal affiliation. Otherwise, the hypothesis remains to be proved. If he was in fact Narbonese, he would have been only the second Gaul to become consul ordinarius, the first being Valerius Asiaticus three years earlier.

Cn. Domitius Afer

In the same year, Domitius Afer, the most outstanding orator of the day was appointed curator aquarum, a post he would keep for ten years until his death in A.D. 59 (Front. Aq. 102; Tac., Ann. 14.19). It was during Afer's tenure in A.D. 52, that the aqueducts Anio Novus and Aqua Claudia were completed[314]. If it can be assumed that the elder Pompeius Paulinus was still praefectus annonae in this year, then the prefectures of both the food and water supply of Rome were now in the hands of Narbonese Gauls.

Special Status for the Narbonese Senators

Further evidence for the expanding influence of the Narbonensians is demonstrated by yet another honour, this time a privilege awarded to the entire senatorial body of that province. Tacitus writes that it was decided in A.D. 49 to allow Narbonese senators "on account of their outstanding regard for the senate" to visit their estates in Narbonensis without first requesting permission from the Emperor (Tac., Ann. 12.23). This was a privilege which, Tacitus states, was hitherto enjoyed only by senators from Sicily[315]. This particular chapter has received little comment, presumably because its ramifications are so self-evident: the decree represented a belief that the senators from Narbonensis were trustworthy and posed no threat to the security of the Empire. It might be added, however, that the enactment of the decree, in which all the Narbonese senators were equally treated, may demonstrate how, in the Roman view, the senators from southern Gaul were viewed as a reliable, cohesive group under the strict leadership of a few loyal men (e.g. Corbulo, Afer).

Tacitus does not say whether Claudius offered this privilege unrequested or if he did so after a delegation from Narbonensis had lobbied him. Certainly, it seems more than just a coincidence that it was granted only a year after the northern Gauls were permitted to join the senate. It is possible that the Narbonese senators, despite their probable intercession on behalf of Tres Galliae, nonetheless believed that they should be on a higher footing than the newer senators from the north and may have therefore desired some privilege which would, in terms of prestige, distinguish Narbonese Gauls from their countrymen of Tres Galliae. Claudius, in turn, may have agreed to the idea, in the expectation that, if one group were distinguished from the other, the two might be less inclined to work too closely together.

P. Pomponius Secundus

In A.D. 50, P. Pomponius Secundus, the half-brother of Corbulo became - or at least emerged as - legate of the army of Upper Germany (Tac. Ann. 12.27). His relationship to Corbulo no doubt played a part in his consideration for the appointment. While in command, he inflicted heavy losses on the Chatti and for that reason, as much as the rescue of a few survivors of the Varian massacre from slavery, he was voted triumphal honours, like his half-brother two years before. In that same year, as it happened, one of the consules ordinarii was M. Suillius Nerullinus who, as the son of P. Suillius Rufus, was nephew of both Pomponius Secundus and Corbulo.

Sex. Afranius Burrus

The following year, Agrippina, the new wife of Claudius and mother of Claudius' adopted son, Nero, decided to remove the two praetorian prefects, Lusius Geta and Rufinus Crispinus, who, she perceived, were still loyal to the memory of Messalina and the claims of the latter's son and Nero's rival, Britannicus (Tac., Ann. 12.42); CD 61.32,69). She managed to convince Claudius to replace these men, whose rivalry was reportedly dividing the praetorians, with a single prefect, namely Claudius' procurator Sex. Afranius Burrus. Burrus, who is described by Tacitus as egregiae famae militaris, a phrase regrettably not explained but presumably the rationale behind the appointment, now single-handedly took charge of the Emperor's personal security.

Although this episode is a crucial event in the reign of Claudius, both Tacitus and Dio regrettably give very abbreviated accounts of it; certainly the development raises questions. Why, for instance, did Claudius, who had personally lived through the terrors of Sejanus, accept the idea of a single praetorian prefect? Agrippina had argued as a pretext that the rivalry of Geta and Crispinus was causing strife among the troops, yet Claudius could have countered that such a situation only warranted the replacing of those officers with two others, not the merging of both posts into one. A second question would be quite simply, "Why Burrus?". Tacitus' comment that Burrus had a remarkable military reputation seems something of an exaggeration; although his inscription (CIL 12, 5842) testifies that he had once served as tribunus militum, since the time of Livia Augusta, he appears to have pursued a non-military career as a behind-the-scenes procurator of the Imperial family. Even if he once did have an outstanding military record, why choose a Gaul when there must have been equally qualified, equally loyal Italian knights from which to choose?

Perhaps these questions might be answered by reference not so much to the influence of Agrippina as to that of the real power behind her: the faction who had installed her as Empress. Narcissus, Pallas and Callistus, realized that they had made enemies when they brought about the death of Messalina; her death, reportedly, had shaken the Emperor's household (Tac.Ann. 12.1). They must have seen that among those who were disaffected and hence a potential threat to the new order were the praetorian prefects. It will have been through Agrippina, then, on whom Claudius doted and whose interests were more or less the same as their own, that the freedmen accomplished their goal of neutralizing Geta and Crispinus. As for Burrus, he was one with whom the freedmen had no doubt long worked in his capacity as an imperial procurator. Not only must they have trusted him, but his Narbonese background and connections must have also been seen as an attractive asset to the procurators. Through his position, he could curry favour and win support for their initiatives from the Narbonese senators who were becoming increasingly more powerful and who, like the freedmen, needed assistance against the resentment and opposition from the old-guard Italian senators. With all this in Burrus' favour, the freedmen and Agrippina may well have assured Claudius that a single prefect was the best solution and that Burrus himself, tested and true since the days of Livia, posed no "Sejanic" threat to his dominion.

A short time before Burrus' installation (Ann. 12.8) Agrippina, and doubtless her allies, had secured the release from exile of L. Annaeus Seneca and then employed the eminent philosopher as tutor of her son, Nero. Rossbach argues that it was after his return from exile[316] that Seneca, a Spaniard, married Paulina, the daughter of Claudius' grain-prefect, Pompeius Paulinus[317]. When one considers Burrus' sudden rise soon after, it is tempting to suppose that Seneca's marriage was designed to bind himself closely to the network which was daily growing more influential and which, though doubtlessly composed of many groups, was controlled largely by Greek procurators and Narbonese nobles. In other words, although both Burrus and Seneca were destined to become the most visibly important men in Nero's reign and much has been written of their ability to secure appointments for their countrymen, their position could be viewed conversely as installed to carry out the wishes of those who had put them in power.

Iulius Paelignus

Although Burrus and Seneca both vanish from the record for the remainder of Claudius' reign, their back-room effectiveness was already being felt. It appears certain that at around this period of the early 50's, Corbulo was proconsul of Asia and Q. Curtius Rufus held the same position in Africa. It is also possible that Iulius Paelignus, the procurator of Cappadocia in A.D. 51 who almost caused a Parthian war in his feeble attempt to recover Armenia (Tac., *Ann*. 12.49) was a Gaul. Not only is he described as *Claudio perquam familiaris*, an expression which recalls the relationship of the procurator L. Vestinus to Claudius, but his *nomen*, Iulius, which was very common throughout Gaul, and even his *cognomen* make one suspicious of a Gallic origin. *Paelignus* denotes a tribe in Italy and one observes among Gauls, both north and south, a penchant for adopting such ethnic Italic names as *cognomina*; cf. Vestinus, Sabinus, Lucanus, Marsus and Tuscus. This does not, of course, amount to definite proof that he was a Gaul but the possibility definitely exists. The fact that Tacitus does not say so outright is hardly an objection, given that he similarly refrains from identifying the origin of such other

Gallic notables as Burrus or Domitius Afer.

Iulius Gallicus

Dio assigns to A.D. 52-53, a humourous story which reveals further evidence of the growing prominence of the Gallic community in Rome, particularly in oratorical circles (CD 61.33,8). According to Dio, a lawyer with what looks an unquestionably Gallic name, Iulius Gallicus, was pleading a case on someone's behalf before Claudius, who was judging the case. The Emperor became vexed from boredom and ordered that Gallicus be hurled into the Tiber. Dio relates that afterwards, Gallicus' client, still in need of help, approached Domitius Afer, who replied "And who told you that I swim better than (Gallicus)?".

Whether Gallicus had, in fact, referred his client to Afer is not clear but it does seem certain that he was one of the Gallic orators now working in Rome. He can, therefore, be counted with such other contemporary Gallic orators as Afer, Clodius Quirinalis, Iulius Africanus, M. Aper and possibly the enigmatic Rufus, who according to Juvenal was called "Cicero Allobrox" (Juv., Sat. 7.213)[318]. While the Gallic advocates in Rome did not represent a majority of their profession, their oratorical skill, which may have resulted ultimately from the Celtic tradition of rhetoric as oral instruction used by the Druids (cf. Caes. BG 6.14), gave them a prestige which far outweighed their numbers. Gallic senators possessed parallel prestige and power within the greater community of the Roman curia.

M. Pompeius Silvanus

At around this same time, Q. Curtius Rufus, the proconsul of the province of Africa, and perhaps the same man referred to as duumvir at Arausio (AE 1986, 475), died in office (Tac., Ann. 11.21). After his death, Rufus was succeeded as proconsul of Africa by Pompeius Silvanus, the Arelatan senator who had been consul eight years before. According to Pflaum, he must have assumed his post in July 1, 53 and remained there until June 30, 56[319]. It was in A.D. 56, two years after the accesion of Nero, that Silvanus was accused, together with another former proconsul of Africa, Sulpicius Camerinus, of some unspecified offenses (Tac., Ann. 13.52). Nero acquitted both men. In Silvanus' case, his magna vis accusatorum apparently needed time to produce witnesses, though he insisted on the trial proceeding immediately. Without witnesses, of course, the plaintiffs had no case. Besides the trial, Tacitus offers some personal details about Silvanus' life namely that he was rich, childless, old (perhaps around 50 years old) and, hence, vulnerable to the ploys of legacy-hunters.

The Death of Claudius

Claudius died in A.D. 54, his death reportedly the result of eating mushrooms. Tacitus puts the blame for his mysterious demise squarely on the shoulders of Agrippina and Nero and declares that his death was, in fact, an assassination and coup d'etat (at novercae (i.e., Agrippinae) insidiis domum omnem convelli, Tac., Ann. 12.65).

This mother and son partnership reportedly had some accomplices among the slaves, but very likely there will also have been more influential people privy to their plans. Given the successful outcome of the conspiracy, the involvement of such individuals as Burrus and Seneca is probable. Tacitus does not say outright that Burrus, for instance, took part in or was privy to the conspiracy, but he hints at complicity in emphasizing that Burrus walked side by side with Nero when the new Emperor was initially greeted by the praetorians (Burro comitante: Ann. 12.69) and that it was at the prefect's encouragement that the praetorians saluted the new Emperor.

At first glance, it might seem almost illogical that Burrus, a Gaul, would support the overthrow of a man whose reign had been so beneficial not only for Gauls in general but for him personally. The best explanation, if we assume he was involved in the plot, might be that for Burrus loyalty played a less important role than practical concerns and fears. Toward the end, so it appears, Claudius had been making moves both to reverse his earlier decision of making Nero his heir and to restore his own son, Britannicus, to his inheritance (Suet., Claud. 43). In particular, he openly regretted having married Agrippina (CD 61.31,1). There are indications that Narcissus too had also grown wearied of Agrippina's power (Tac., Ann. 12.65). Amid these cracks and signs of disunity, the conspirators decided to act immediately. Agrippina may well have warned Burrus, whose control of the praetorians was vital for a peaceful transition of power, that if Claudius divorced her on suspicion of conspiracy or treason, then he, Burrus, would likewise be under suspicion since he was one of her appointees. Furthermore, he must have realized that even if he survived after Agrippina's downfall, Claudius' new-found awareness would have made the Emperor less amenable to his suggestions. In contrast to the more-experienced and increasingly more distrustful Claudius, there was Nero who, as an immature boy under the tutelage of both Burrus himself and Seneca, would be far easier to manipulate; hence there would be fewer problems in bringing about desired change or legislation. Amid all this, two somewhat incriminating points emerge: Burrus may have had reasons for wanting Claudius overthrown, and he took an immediate role in securing Nero's accession. The presence of both motive and circumstantial evidence makes the case for his innocence difficult to argue. Whether other prominent Gauls were involved in this "coup d'etat" cannot be ascertained, though some of them in the early years of Nero's reign, i.e., Pompeius Paulinus (the brother-in-law of Seneca), Duvius Avitus (Burrus' fellow Vocontian) and Corbulo, did benefit greatly from Burrus' added influence with important military commands. While the involvement or even awareness of the more influential Gauls is unclear, the direct participation of a Gallic woman, i.e., Lucusta, looks certain. At all events the scholiast in Juvenal states that this notoriously famous poisoner, who was later implicated in Britannicus' murder (Tac., Ann. 13.15), was "ex Galliis[320]. (Like the notorious Licinus in the days of Augustus, she became a generic Gaul, with no reference made to her specific home.) While it is difficult to say for certain that this Gaul, Lucusta, whose name, incidentally, is found epigraphically among the Sequani (CIL 13, 5391), was connected with or aided in her task by the Gaul, Burrus, Tacitus writes that when she undertook the task of poisoning Britannicus, she was helped by a tribune of the praetorians who also bore a name which may indicate Gallic origin, Iulius Pollio (Tac., Ann. 13.15)[321]. Rewarded with gifts and impunity by Nero, she lived peacefully until the reign of Galba, who executed her because of her complicity in the previous reign. As if cursed by the ghost of Claudius, she then, like others involved in his murder, i.e., Agrippina, Nero and possibly Seneca and Burrus, also met a violent end.

Conclusion

Claudius stated quite clearly in his speech on the admission of Gauls to the senate that the decree was a continuation of the process begun by Augustus and Tiberius in which senatorial rights were expanded beyond the shores of Italy. In this way, he was giving a precedent for his move, while humbly abdicating any credit for the initiative. In the estimation of Gauls themselves, however, the credit belonged entirely to Claudius. Like the inscriptions and monuments dedicated throughout the whole of Gaul to Tiberius (cf. *CIL* 13.3570, above p. 63), those to Claudius also reveal a genuine gratitude and perhaps even affection for the beneficent ruler. One, for instance, set up by Iulius Victor of the Santones, honoured the accomplishments of Claudius (*CIL* 13, 1037) while another is a dedication to Divus Augustus on behalf of Claudius' health and well-being (*CIL* 13, 1642). The text of this latter inscription, found in the region of the Segusiavi, reads as follows:

> *Divo Augusto sacrum* ¦ *pro salute Ti(beri) Claudi* ¦ *Caesaris August(i) Germ(anici)* ¦ *Ti(berius) Claudius Arucae fil(ius) Capito* ¦ *sacerdos Aug(usti) theatrum quod* ¦ *Lupus Anthi f(ilius) ligneum posuerat* ¦ *d(e) s(ua) p(ecunia) lapideum restituit*.

Apparently Tiberius Claudius Capito, a priest of Augustus who may well have received citizenship from Claudius himself, was asking the deified Augustus to ensure the safety of the present Emperor. Finally, a third inscription, found near Arelate (*CIL* 12, 641) attests a certain L. Valerius Placidus who makes a dedication *ex testamento* to the Divus Claudius. The text expresses a sentiment perhaps pervasive throughout Gaul. It suggests that Claudius was revered in death just as he had been appreciated in life.

That there were justifiable reasons for this view of Claudius is perfectly obvious. We have seen that under this reign there was a marked upgrading of the road-system (admittedly intended to facilitate the expedition to Britain but nevertheless of benefit to Gaul afterwards) and a significant increase in capital projects, such as aqueducts for Burdigula and Lugdunum, amphitheatres for the Turones and the Santones and a theatre at Forum Segusiavorum (Feurs)[322]. Besides these material improvements, both individuals and entire states had their civil status enhanced. The epigraphical evidence, particularly from Tres Galliae, reveals a large number of citizens named Tiberius Claudius (e.g. the above mentioned T. Claudius Capito), a fact which likely indicates enfranchisement by Claudius himself. Among the promotions there are such examples as Augusta Treverorum and Colonia Agrippinensium, essentially of Belgica, and Avennio in Narbonensis to full colonial status not to mention the organization of the Silvanectes and the Frisii in a standard Roman form of self-government. Certain towns in Gaul, i.e., Octodurus, Axima (later Forum Claudii) and Claudiomagus, were honoured with Claudius' own patronage.

For our purposes, Gallic advancement in the Roman senate is one of the most striking features of Claudius' reign. Besides the celebrated decree which allowed citizens of Tres Galliae to apply for senatorial status, there was also a marked increase in the number of senators from Narbonensis.

Among those whom we can positively identify from the "province" are D. Valerius Asiaticus, his existent though enigmatic and nameless brother, Cn. Domitius Afer, (T.?) Domitius Decidius, M. Pompeius Silvanus, Pompeius Paulinus and L. Duvius Avitus. These men, whose combined number doubles the three senators under Tiberius who could be positively identified as Gallic, all became consul, with the probable exception of Domitius Decidius. Even more impressive in number is the list of those who may have been Gallic senators under Claudius. Those whom we have identified as possibly Narbonese (or definitely Narbonese and possibly under Claudius), include Cn. Domitius Corbulo, M. Iulius Graecinus who was the brother of L. Graecinus, Q. Curtius Rufus and C. Pompeius Longinus Gallus. As for the men adlected from Tres Galliae after A.D. 48, the names of none of them are certain but some have, nevertheless, been proposed with varying degrees of certainty. These include the father of Iulius Vindex, M. (Iulius?) Aper, M. Iulius Romulus, Iulius Africanus and Q. Iulius Secundus.

During the reign of Claudius, therefore, we can identify as many as sixteen senators who were or possibly were from Gaul. When one considers what proportion of the four hundred or so senators serving at the same time can be named (perhaps half?), it is quite possible that there may have been a further sixteen Gallic senators, rich men whose names have been lost from inscriptions or whose back-bench careers were, quite simply, too insignificant to be remembered in the Annals.

In addition to these senators, prominent equestrians from Gaul also served in Claudius' bureaucracy. Though the number of knights pales in comparison with the list of senators, the influence of the knights was arguably as important as that of the *egregii*. Three names especially stand out among the Gallic knights in Claudius' court, namely Pompeius Paulinus, who was the father of the senator of the same name, L. (Iulius) Vestinus, who likewise was the father of a senator, and Sex. Afranius Burrus. Two other equestrians who may have been Gauls are noted during this same time, Catonius Iustus and Iulius Paelignus.

It is probably not so much the numbers as the positions which many of these Gauls held, as senators and knights, which help to reveal (almost expose) the power which they exercised in Claudius' inner circle. This is best demonstrated in the commands of important armies. In A.D. 47, for example, the armies of both Germanies were commanded by men who were arguably Narbonese, i.e., Q. Curtius Rufus in Upper Germany, Domitius Corbulo in the Lower. Tacitus writes that Valerius Asiaticus had been preparing to visit one of these armies just before that time (Tac., *Ann*. 11.2), a statement regrettably ambiguous in that it is not clear whether he had been appointed commander or was simply intending an informal inspection. Rufus was succeeded around A.D. 50 by Corbulo's half-brother, P. Pomponius, whereas the army of Lower Germany was later (i.e., early in the reign of Nero) to be commanded by two Narbonese Gauls in succession, Pompeius Paulinus (56-58) and L. Duvius Avitus (58-60). In the same general frontier and perhaps not many years after he had been adlected, M. Iulius Romulus served as legate of the Legion XV Apollinaris in Pannonia. Later, under Nero, A. Marius Celsus, usually considered a descendant of the Nemausan quattuovir C. Marius Celsus of the early empire, was put in charge of this same legion which was then commissioned to provide support for Corbulo's Eastern campaigns[323]. In light of this evidence it is not unlikely that the administration in Rome had developed a policy around this time whereby preference was given to Narbonese candidates for armies which were heavily Gallic in composition.

Besides military postings, many of these same Gallic senators added, like others, to their prestige and power by service in the civil administration of provinces. Corbulo, for example, not long after serving in Lower Germany, perhaps around A.D. 50, became proconsul of Asia. At approximately the same period, M. Iulius Romulus was legatus pro praetore of the same province and Iulius Paelignus, an equestrian, served as procurator of Cappadocia which, incidentally, Corbulo later received under Nero. Iulius Romulus, after his term in Asia was completed bacame legatus pro praetore of Cyprus and then proconsul of Macedonia (above p. 190).

In Africa, Q. Curtius Rufus, possibly from the colony of Arausio, governed as proconsul from sometime around A.D. 50 until his death in 53. He was succeeded by the Arelatan, M. Pompeius Silvanus, who served until 56. During Silvanus' tenure there, Q. Iulius Secundus, possibly one of those adlected from Tres Galliae, was, as inferred by epigraphical evidence dating to A.D. 55 (CIL 8, 8837), to have been legatus pro praetore of neighboring Mauretania. Finally, late in the reign of Claudius as indicated by his succeeding consulship in A.D. 56, Duvius Avitus served as legate of the province of Aquitania. So, at a time when Gallic commanders basically had control of the northern frontier, the important provinces of Asia and Africa (and even some places surrounding both) were also in Gallic hands.

The influence of this same identifiable group is further discerned in their important role in the imperial bureaucracy at Rome. Domitius Afer, for example, was appointed curator aquarum in A.D. 49, a post he continued to hold until his death ten years later (Frontin., Aq. 102; Tac., Ann. 14.19). In this position he was responsible for maintaining adequate water for the city, so its vital importance can hardly be over-emphasized. Afer was not the only Narbonese senator to hold the post. The list of curatores aquarum given by Frontinus (Aq. 102) confirms that M. Porcius Cato, arguably a senator from Narbo, held the position for just a month in A.D. 38 before he fell victim to Caligula (see above p. 133). From the years 64 to 66, the curator was P. Marius Celsus, whose family appears to have originated from Afer's own colony, Nemausus. The often-mentioned M. Pompeius Silvanus served from A.D. 71-73, while finally Frontinus himself, who, according to both Syme[324] and Birley[325], came from Gallia Narbonensis, was appointed in A.D. 97 and served until his third consulship in A.D. 100. In other words, of the fifty or so years from the time Afer assumed that office until Frontinus resigned from it, Narbonese Gauls served as curatores of the water-supply for twenty years or forty percent of the time.

Almost as important as the water supply in Rome, was the supply of staple food, which in Roman terms meant grain. In the management of this grain supply during the reign of Claudius, Gauls appear once again to be well-represented. In A.D. 48, Pompeius Paulinus emerges historically as Claudius' praefectus annonae; that is, the equestrian official whose responsibility was to ensure an adequate supply of grain for the population. It is unclear how long he held this position but the time may have overlapped the year in which Iulius Romulus was appointed pro praefectus frumenti dandi, a senatorial office which was responsible for the distribution of the grain that Paulinus strove to maintain. Later, in A.D. 59/60, Nero appointed Claudius' trusted procurator, L. Vestinus to the office of prefect of Egypt, the importance of which was based largely on its abundant grain harvest.

Lastly, there remains the Gallic role in commanding the Praetorian Guard, which served as the Emperor's own legion and bodyguard. As early as the time of Augustus, the Guard had Gallic recruits, so many in fact, according to Cassius Dio, that Augustus feared they might revolt after the Varian disaster (CD 56.23,4). While individual praetorians from Gaul under Augustus were under a constant cloud of suspicion and were probably restricted in their avenues of promotion, under Claudius perhaps two Gauls reached the praefecture. Catonius Iustus emerges as one of the prefects in A.D. 43. Arguably Gallic, even specifically Belgic by virtue of his nomen, he may have held the position since A.D. 41 after the resignation of M. Arrecinus Clemens. In 43, according to Dio, Messalina learned that Catonius intended to inform Claudius about her infidelities and for that she had him killed. The fate of the next Gallic prefect was considerably more fortunate. Sex. Afranius Burrus became sole prefect of the praetorians in A.D. 51, an appointment which was secured through the intercession of Agrippina. Except for his installation, Burrus, who originated from Vasio, does not figure again historically in the reign of Claudius though he does re-emerge immediately afterwards with the accession of Nero. Remaining in office until his death in A.D. 62, he became, together with Seneca, the son-in-law of the procurator Pompeius Paulinus, one of the two most powerful individuals in Nero's principate[326].

While some have held that Gallic promotion subsequent to

A.D. 51 was due largely to the influence of Burrus, it might be argued that Burrus was himself simply an agent installed to promote the interests of the insiders who effectively managed the affairs of state, a group which included among its forefront members, Claudius' procurators and the Narbonese senators. This latter idea seems more likely since it is difficult to think, for instance, that men with such political and military connections as senators and specially ex-consuls would now become obliged to a newly emerged procurator for any further advancement and not the other way around. Rather than supposing that Pompeius Paulinus or Duvius Avitus, for example, were appointed to the command of the Lower German armies by Burrus' own authority, one might incline to another possible interpretation of the events, namely that Burrus, himself relatively powerless, was obligated to the men who installed him and that he had been instructed by his superiors to secure such appointments as mentioned above and doubtless others.

What one can legitimately state is that from A.D. 47-60 many of the most important administrative and military positions of the Imperial service were controlled, perhaps even dominated by Narbonese Gauls. Whether this means that these men, backed by the monetary and military resources of Gaul, had effectively taken over sole control of the whole governing apparatus is unlikely. Although obviously powerful, the senators from Gaul were still very much a minority who would scarcely have been able to make changes without ample support from outside their own circle. Since they could not effect what they wanted simply by the strength of their own group, they must have been compelled to invite into their society like-minded allies. As such, one group which seems to have worked closely with the Gauls was the Imperial procurators. Cassius Dio, for example, writes that even during the reign of Caligula, Callistus, who later became Claudius' *a libellis*, had forged a friendship or alliance with Domitius Afer, a connection which saved Afer's life (CD 59.19,6). The very fact that the Gauls achieved their most important benefits during the heyday of the procurators (i.e., the admission of *nobiles* from Tres Galliae into the senate, the privileges granted to the senators from Narbonensis and the appointment of Burrus to praetorian prefect, a move which facilitated other Gallic promotions) leads one to conclude that they were actively supported by the procurators; any opposition on the latter's part at that time would have assuredly doomed such initiatives in advance.

Seneca's emergence at the same time as that of Burrus may indicate that the Spanish municipal aristocracy were likewise in a court-alliance with the Gauls and the procurators. Although Spanish advancement is not as obvious as Gallic during this period, a number of Spaniards nonetheless did reach the consulship in the reigns of Claudius and Nero. Besides Seneca himself (cos. A.D. 56) and his brother Junius

Gallio (cos. 55), other prominent consular Spaniards include L. Pedanius Secundus (cos. 43) of Barcino, his son Cn. Pedanius Salinator (cos. 60/61) and M. Manilius Vopiscus (cos. 60)[327]. The idea that the Spanish united with the Narbonese and other Gauls is by no means unthinkable, particularly when one considers Spain's proximity to Narbo and its trade relations with Gaul in general[328].

If there is a common thread between these three groups, the Greek procurators, the Gallic (in the broadest sense) senators and the Spanish élite, one can say that all of them were wealthy non-Italians who, perhaps, felt genuinely alienated from the old governing Roman establishment and who realized that, if they wanted a greater share of power, then, as individual groups, they would have to forge a broader alliance against the established interests. If their alliance was, in fact, a faction composed of new senators who had little in common with the upper level of Roman society, then its membership may even have included senators from the small towns of Italy, especially perhaps those of Cisalpine Gaul. The composition of this whole faction will thus have been broadly based and in its attempt to secure promotion for itself, have accepted the Narbonese sub-faction as leader, doubtless because of its immense wealth and close military ties. It would make sense, moreover, to conclude that after A.D. 47 Corbulo was, in effect, the leader of the entire faction. As a military man and the son of a Gallic father and

Italian mother, he had all the necessary attributes and connections to which the different groups could relate.

Admittedly this whole theory is a hypothesis with varying support from historical and epigraphical sources. If it is true, however, it sheds an interesting new light on the period particularly with regard to the benefits which Gaul received and the motives and inspiration behind the various measures. Furthermore, if such benefits as the extension of senatorial privileges or the appointment of Burrus happened as a result of the lobby, led by Corbulo (among others), one might question whether the execution of Valerius Asiaticus was not instigated by that lobby as well. Although Scramuzza may be right that Asiaticus' execution raised tensions among the Gauls which Claudius calmed only by allowing them in the Senate, another view of the whole episode is also conceivable. As discussed previously (above p. 149), Asiaticus was instrumental in the overthrow of Caligula, an event which precipitated the murder of Corbulo's half-sister Milonia Caesonia and his niece, Julia Drusilla. Corbulo's reaction to this outrage is unrecorded, but we do know that one of his half-brothers, Q. Pomponius Secundus vehemently opposed the new order which installed itself in the early days of Claudius' reign and even attempted to overthrow the new regime, only to perish in the attempt. Corbulo emerged only once historically between A.D. 39-47 and in that instance he was reprimanded for wrongdoings committed during the reign of

Caligula. In A.D. 47, Asiaticus, a recent consul ordinarius, was tried on suspicion of treason; foremost among his accusers was P. Suillius Rufus, half-brother of Milonia Caesonia, Corbulo, et al. Immediately after Asiaticus' execution, Corbulo who, if Narbonese, now became the principal senator from Gaul, re-appears in the *Annals* in the prestigous and powerful post of legate of the Lower German army. Thereafter follow the decrees which favor Gaul, particularly its most powerful inhabitants.

The idea is to some extent supported further by the events at the end of Nero's reign. Corbulo, either because of his relationship as father-in-law to the conspirator, Annius Vinicianus, or because Nero feared his personal ambitions, was ordered to commit suicide in A.D. 67. Within a year, Iulius Vindex led a rebellion against Nero, raising as allies Arverni, Sequani and Aedui, important states which had no doubt benefitted from the senatorial decree of A.D. 48, and the colony of Vienna which, one suspects, may have been the home of Corbulo (see above p. 89). They were not joined, however, by the Belgic tribes of the Treveri or the Lingones; in fact, these tribes, fought against Vindex and later supported the champion of the opposite cause, A. Vitellius, with whom Valerius Asiaticus, son of the former consul, aligned himself (Tac., *Hist*. 1.59). This younger Asiaticus, incidentally, appears to have been named governor of Belgica shortly after Corbulo's death.

It is possible, then, to read the trial of Asiaticus as part of an internal rivalry at Vienna (cf. Vell. Pater. 2.121.1) in which Asiaticus and his family vied with Corbulo and his family for supremacy not only in that colonia but in all four provinces of Gaul. Ultimately, despite the vicissitudes of both families' fortunes, Corbulo's family appears to have reached the highest level of power. After the civil wars of 69-70 had ended and the Flavians were installed to power (largely by the help of many Gauls such as M. Antonius Primus of Tolosa, M. Pompeius Silvanus of Arelate, M. Aponius Saturninus of Baeterrae and Cn. Iulius Agricola of Forum Julii), one of Vespasian's sons, Domitian, married Domitia Longina, the daughter of Corbulo. Although the later official version of this marriage claimed that Domitian in effect stole Domitia from her husband, Aelius Lamia (Suet., Dom. 1.3), it is possible the story was contrived to absolve her or her supporters of any responsibility for Domitian's reign. Quite possibly the marriage between Domitian and Domitia was arranged so that the ruling family would now be united with a representative of the Narbonese faction in the senate. A similar situation had existed during the reign of Caligula when for a time Asiaticus and later Corbulo became brothers-in-law to the Emperor.

Throughout all this discussion of the reign of Claudius and the subsequent period, little has, admittedly, has been said about Claudius himself and what role, if any, he played in the factional politics of the Senate. Certainly, he had the potential to form alliances just as much as other senators. The irony of the situation, however, is that although Claudius was the scion of one of the gentes maiores, that is, the aristocracy of the patriciate, and as such would be expected to support the interests of the established senatorial families, he appears to have supported the provincials. The point is demonstrated best by his decision to allow Gauls into the senate in spite of the opposition levelled at the move by the Italians. Why Claudius supported these provincials over the aristocrats may perhaps be explained not so much by reasons of state policy as by Claudius' own personal, psychological development. Rejected or simply despised in his early years by his own family (Suet., Claud. 3-5)[329], he developed little or no attachment to it; as a consequence Suetonius writes that Claudius put five members to death, namely his father-in-law, Appius Silanus, Tiberius' grandaughter, Julia, his own niece Julia and his two sons-in-law, Gnaeus Pompeius and Lucius Silanus (Suet., Claud. 29). (Besides these, one would have to include Messalina.) On the other hand, his childhood friends included such foreigners as Athenodorus (Suet., Claud. 4) and Herod Agrippa and members of the lower classes (ibid. 5), both groups lying at best on the periphery of aristocratic Roman society. So his eventual support of a faction which struggled to promote itself against an entrenched old-order was very much in keeping with his character. Their support for his initiatives, in particular the British campaign, and his support of theirs made for a mutually-beneficial and friendly working relationship.

A further irony in the whole situation is that in spite of the rewards and benefits which Claudius bestowed on this faction and on the Gauls in particular - capital works, citizenship, senatorial privileges - it appears that some of the same beneficiaries eventually became partners in his assassination. The direct involvement of the Gallic woman, Lucusta, and the probable complicity of Burrus, who in turn was connected to the Narbonese senators make one suspect that many whom Claudius promoted now joined together to kill him. The reason for their involvement seems to lie in their fear of his sudden change of policy. Until very late in the reign, Agrippina and others were expecting that Nero would inherit the principate, not Britannicus, the son of the executed Messalina. Many of those involved in Messalina's death suspected that Britannicus intended to avenge his mother and punish those responsible for her execution. Whether or not the Gauls participated in Messalina's downfall is unknown, but the general feeling must have pervaded the court that Britannicus might eye suspiciously anyone who had prospered in the political sphere from A.D. 48 - A.D. 54. As beneficiaries par excellence, the Gauls must have realized that their recent progress would be in jeopardy if Britannicus succeeded. In their own interests, then, Claudius had to be removed. Since there was no mechanism for abdication and since outright revolution would have caused a civil war, the only avenue left for the nervous members of that faction was to remove him discreetly by poison. After Claudius' death there was a smooth administrative transition and the clique which through Claudius' favour had entrenched itself in the previous regime was still very much a force to reckon with.

CONCLUSION

Senatorial factions always played an important role in Roman politics. The policies which guided the Empire always sprang initially from the platform of one faction or another which then lobbied others to have it adopted. Until the first century B.C., the leadership of these groups was held exclusively by the principal, patrician families, the gentes maiores, especially the Cornelii, the Fabii and the Claudii. Such families, with their own interests and, perhaps, the greater interests of the state in mind, forged alliances, in turn, with other senatorial families in order to secure their desired objectives. Toward the end of the Republic, the Cornelii et al. still maintained much of their influence, though their strict hold on leadership was beginning to show signs of weakening. New men of less exalted backgrounds began to emerge from the ranks to take positions of highest authority. C. Marius, a novus homo, is the most obvious example of this development but even his contemporary rivals and successors came from families which could never match the lustre of the patrician Claudii, for example (cf. Suet., Tib. 2). Cornelius Sulla and Iulius Caesar may have belonged to patrician families but they themselves came from branches which had been relatively insignificant for centuries. Licinius Lucullus, Licinius Crassus, Pompeius Magnus and M. Antonius were all of noble though plebeian stock while

Aemilius Lepidus, although belonging to a patrician family of the highest order, was the least powerful member of the second triumvirate.

The civil wars and proscriptions of the first century B.C. had a devastating effect on the ruling families of Rome, both those whose roots stretched back to the beginnings of the Republic and those whose *nobilitas* was more recent. Therefore, when Octavian assumed sole stewardship of the entire Empire in 31 B.C., one of his first duties was to replace the last senators with new ones. It was from the Italian *municipia* that Augustus chose most of the latter new senators though some were taken from among the colonists of the western provinces of Spain and Gaul. This policy set a precedent which was expanded by Augustus' successors and which changed the face of the Roman senate forever. Nevertheless, while the faces and names may have changed, the phenomenon of factions became as evident in this period as it was in the Republic. The desire of men to improve their situation by forging alliances is a universal trait common to men of all times and backgrounds.

The focus of this thesis has been the influence, if any, enjoyed by one "faction", namely the senators and equestrians from Gaul, in the Imperial court from the accession of Octavian until the death of Claudius. The investigation was prompted largely by the observations of some prominent modern historians who claimed that Gaul, in general, made only a minimal contribution to the newly emergent ruling class of the Empire. We have seen that Garnsey and Saller, for instance, hold that Sherwin-White is unjustified in claiming that Gauls had a proportionate share in the Roman upper class. They add that Petilius Cerealis' claim that Gauls were actually in command of legions was a hollow one which no one could take seriously. In support of the same argument, King calculates that only 3.1% of all senators and 4.2% of equestrians were Gallic.

These arguments look to be flawed for at least three reasons. First, the statistics presumably take into account only the names which are definitely known. Though not conclusive, the evidence nevertheless, suggests that many others may have originated from Gaul. Secondly, historians who diminish the role of Gaul in Roman Imperial history appear to restrict the term Gallic to a native of Tres Galliae, an artificial termination which enables them to ignore the contributions of Gallia Narbonensis. Nevertheless the inhabitants of that latter province, however Romanized they may have appeared, were still Gauls, a point demonstrated in historical records time and time again. Thus, Valerius Asiaticus from Vienna apparently carried enough influence in Gaul to pose a serious threat there (Tac., Ann. 11.2). Pompeius Paulinus, a senator from Arelate, was described as a man "dressed in the skins of his father's race" (Pliny, HN 33.143). Antonius Primus of Tolosa, the commander of Legio

VII in A.D. 69, was in his youth called Becco, the Gallic word for (and ancestor of) "beak" (Suet., Vit. 18). And how can Garnsey and Saller claim that Gauls did not command armies by A.D. 69, when we know for certain that the Gauls Pompeius Paulinus and Pompeius Silvanus of Arelate, Duvius Avitus of Vasio, Aurelius Fulvus of Nemausus and Antonius Primus of Tolosa had all done that very thing?

Thirdly, the argument that Gauls contributed only minimally ignores the vast influence of even the few whom we can positively identify. For example, when Valerius Asiaticus became suffect consul in A.D. 35, he became the first non-Italian to assume that office since Cornelius Balbus had done so in 40 B.C. Asiaticus became so powerful, in fact, that he seriously considered seizing the Empire after the death of Caligula and he may have been involved in a similar attempt during the reign of Claudius. Domitius Afer of Nemausus, consul of A.D. 39, and Iulius Africanus, a native of Tres Galliae who may also have been a senator, were considered during the reign of Nero to have been the most outstanding orators of their time (Quint., Inst. 10.1.118). The two men who replaced them in that position under the Flavians, i.e., Aper and Iulius Secundus, were likewise Gallic. Afranius Burrus, L. Vestinus and the elder Pompeius Paulinus were among the most trusted equestrians in the court of Claudius.

It is true that Gauls wielded little influence while Augustus ruled. His monarchy was an ethnocentric reign which jealously guarded Roman institutions for Italians alone. Under Tiberius, however, the foundations were laid for an effective senatorial lobby from Gallia Narbonensis. At that time, such prominent Gauls emerged at the Imperial court as Valerius Asiaticus, Domitius Afer, Iulius Graecinus, Afranius Burrus and perhaps Domitius Corbulo and Pompeius Silvanus. These men doubtless represented the core of the Narbonese Gallic lobby, to whom belongs the major responsibility for the development and promotion of the four provinces of Gaul. Interestingly, as Syme has already pointed out, these men seem to have been not of Italian colonist but rather of native Gallic stock. When one examines their origins even more closely - in particular Valerius Asiaticus and perhaps Domitius Corbulo from Vienna of the Allobroges, Domitius Afer from Nemausus of the Volcae Arecomici, Pompeius Silvanus of Arelate and Iulius Graecinus of Forum Julii, both of which were part of the realm of the Salluvii, Afranius Burrus of Vasio of the Vocontii - it becomes clear that they derived their origins from the states which first allied themselves in 125 B.C. to defeat the Roman-Massiliot alliance. In other words, the ties which bound those tribes together in 125 B.C. were still present in the first century A.D. What had changed, however, was their motives. Still united, they were concerned now not to break away from the Roman Empire but to prosper within it. They achieved this goal by taking advantage of both their Gallic birth and their Roman citizenship. From the former they inherited the military alliances which had been forged generations before they were born; thanks to the latter they profited from such things as promotion and monetary reward for loyal military service as well as legal rights to invest their wealth throughout the Empire. The combination of military connections and financial resources made this group a formidable force in Roman affairs, allowing them, during the reigns of Claudius and of Nero, to take control of a number of bureaucratic offices as well as the effective control of the Lower German army (Pompeius Paulinus and Duvius Avitus) and the Eastern campaigns (Domitius Corbulo, Aurelius Fulvus).

The descendants of these men continued to flourish under the Flavian dynasty. Agricola and the adopted sons of Domitius Afer were enrolled among the patricians. Although Corbulo himself never became Emperor, his daughter, Domitia Longina, nonetheless became an Empress as the wife of Domitian. Another Narbonese woman, Pompeia Plotina, followed in Domitia's footsteps as the wife of the Emperor Trajan. The honors enjoyed by Gaul culminated, however, in A.D. 138, when T. Aurelius Fulvus Antoninus Pius, grandson of a senator from Nemausus, ascended to the purple on the death of Hadrian and then reigned for twenty-two years. In retrospect, therefore, it is difficult to conclude from the evidence in toto, that the contribution of the Gauls during this period was slight. In point of fact, upper class Gauls had gradually, unflamboyantly, become linked inextricably to the Imperial court, so much so that by the time Antoninus Pius became Emperor, his origin from Gaul, a country once considered the perennial enemy of Rome, was not even an issue.

ENDNOTES

1. A.N. Sherwin-White Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome (Cambridge, 1967), 55.

2. J. Drinkwater, "The Rise and Fall of the Gallic Julii", Latomus 37 (1978), 817-850.

3. P. Garnsey and R. Saller The Roman Empire, (London, 1987), 10.

4. Garnsey/Saller, above n. 3, 18.

5. A. King, Roman Gaul and Germany, (London, 1990), 87-88.

6. C. Ebel, Transalpine Gaul: The Emergence of a Roman Province, (Leiden, 1976), 66.

7. Ebel, above n. 6, 67.

8. Ebel, above n. 6, 68.

9. R. Stillwell, ed., The Princeton Encyclopedia of Classical Sites, (Princeton, 1976), 958.

10. Stillwell, above n. 9, 956 and H. Rolland s.v. "Vocontii", RE IX.A.1, 705.

11. Cf. M. Rambaud (L'Art de la Déformation Historique dans les commentaires de César, (Paris, 1966), 9): "Le proconsul avait alors le loisir et le besoin de defendre sa gloire militaire et sa situation politique". In other words, his military and political

careers were inextricably linked.

12. According to Caesar, the Remi and the Lingones did not join the rebels because of their loyalty to Rome, whereas the Treveri did not participate because they were engaged with the Germans (B.G. 7.63).

13. Caesar's exact words are: (Helvetii) Allobrogibus sese vel persuasuros quod nondum bono animo in populum Romanum viderentur, existimabant vel ....

14. Stillwell, above n. 9.35.

15. A.L.F. Rivet, Gallia Narbonensis: Southern Gaul in Roman Times, (London, 1988), 16.

16. Ebel, above n. 6, 30.

17. Ebel, above n. 6, 31.

18. Ihm ("Aquae Sextiae" RE 3,306) writes: "Anfangs war es nur ein castellum, nicht, wie Livius falschlich angiebt, Colonie ...". In other words, Livy has confused the establishment of a fort with that of a colony.

19. In other words, family members of the conqueror were already taking an active role in developing ties in Gaul.

20. Rivet states that the colonists enrolled in the Papirian tribe were veterans of the Tenth Legion, settled there in 42 B.C. by T.

Claudius Nero, the father of Tiberius, cf. Rivet, above n. 15, 131, 134.

21. F. Munzer, "C. Valerius Caburrus (114)" RE II 14, 2348.

22. C. Nipperley quoted by A. Klotz "Pompeius Trogus (142)", RE XXI 2, 2300.

23. It was, in fact, the fourth commonest nomen found in that province. cf. R. Syme, Tacitus (Oxford, 1958), 783.

24. One gauge of their retention of Celtic culture is the presence of Druidism there. Cicero, for instance, declares in the Pro Fonteio that even at that time (69 B.C.), the Gauls carried on "that savage, barbarous custom of sacrificing human beings" (Font. 31). Much later, Augustus decreed that Roman citizens in Gaul were forbidden to practise Druidism (Suet., Claud. 25), which must imply that they were doing precisely that. Prohibitions applicable to everyone in Gaul were subsequently decreed by Tiberius (Pliny, HN 30.13) and Claudius (Suet., Claud. 25). Claudius, in fact, ordered the execution of a Vocontian knight who was carrying a serpent's egg, something considered a Druidic symbol (Pliny, HN 29.54).

25. J. Drinkwater, above n. 2, 818.

26. Drinkwater, above n. 2, 819.

27. See above, n. 19.

28. T.P. Wiseman, "Two More Senators", CQ 59 (1965), 159-160.

29. T.P. Wiseman, New Men in the Roman Senate 139 B.C. - A.D. 14 (Oxford, 1971) 23, 221.

30. On Roman fear of Northerners, see Colin Wells, The German Policy of Augustus, (Oxford, 1972), 15.

31. CAH 10, 116.

32. H. Benario, "Tacitus, Trier and the Treveri, CJ 83 (1988), 233-239 at 233, argues that it was at this time that Augustus established the colonia Augusta Treverorum.

33. E. Birley, The Roman Army, (Amsterdam, 1988), 739-440.

34. A quick glance at CIL 13.6866-6985 shows that the bulk of the recruits whom we can identify were either from Narbonensis or Cisalpine Gaul. cf. CAH, above n. 31, 358, "The existence of the Germans, then, was one of the surest bonds of Gallic loyalty".

35. J.J. Hatt, Histoire de la Gaule Romaine (Paris, 1959), 95, disagrees with the likelihood of Augustus rewarding with citizenship. He writes that in contrast to Julius Caesar, "Augustus fut très avare du droit de cité et préferait concéder des immunités fiscales".

36. H. Last, "Rome and the Druids: A Note", JRS 39 (1949), 1-4, disagrees however with the prevailing view. He states "If the trouble over the Druids in Gaul was caused simply by

Roman suspicion of their loyalty, the whole affair could claim no more than a modest degree of attention due to a question of public order. But if, on the other hand, the cause was Rome's insistence that these Gallic newcomers to the Empire should henceforth live conformably to principles with which the sacrifice of human beings was incompatible, then the episode has a place in the story of the civilizing of Western Europe".

37. D. Fishwick, The Imperial Cult in the Latin West, (Leiden, (1987), 1.1, 97.

38. A.J. Christopherson, "The Provincial Assembly of the Three Gauls", Historia 17 (1968), 351-366 at 353.

39. Christopherson, above n. 38, 384-364.

40. Many of those Gauls who were called Marcus Iulius either received their citizenship through Livia or were descended from men who did. They took Livia's adoptive family name and the praenomen of her father, Marcus Livius; cf. PIR^2, Vol. 4, p. 142, n. 157.

41. Suetonius' perception of Augustus' goal was stated thus: "atque ab colluvione peregrini ac servilis sanguinis incorruptum servare populum, ...".

42. P. Garnsey and R. Saller, above n. 3, 13-14.

43. This name has been included on the assumption that it is the Lucus Augusti in Gaul, i.e., Luc-en-Diois, and not the Lucus Augusti in Spain, i.e., Lugo. The nomen, Troianius, is itself not found epigraphically in either Spain or Gaul.

44. The name *Capnus* is found on a bottle at Arelate (*CIL* 12. 5696, 4) and it can be compared with *Capenus* the name of one who on Livy's testimony, was the Sequanian who killed Dec. Brutus (Livy, *Epit*. 120). Maricanus looks similar in form to Mariccus, the Boian rabble-rouser, who tried to take advantage of the situation in 68/69 by starting a revolt (Tac. *Hist*. 2.61). The name *Calenus* is mentioned by Tacitus as that of an Aeduan tribune during the Year of the Four Emperors (Tac., *Hist*. 1.35); the same man's name may appear on the inscription *CIL* 13, 2805. The *nomen* Coelius (var. Caelius) is very common in Narbonensis, cf. Syme *Tacitus* (Oxford, 1958) 2, 783. The -*rix* suffix of Elvorix assuredly makes this name Gallic. The name itself is found epigraphically in the region of the Mediomatrici in Belgica (*CIL* 13, 4301 b 5).

45. Cottius was the name of the Celto-Ligurian prefect who gave his name to the Cottian Alps and Donnus was his father (*CIL* 5, 5271). The name *Bitutius* is almost identical to Bituitus, the Arvernian king whom Fabius Maximus defeated in 121 B.C. (Livy, *Ep*. 61). E. Evans, *Gaulish Personal Names*, (Oxford, 1967), 185, places the name *Comagius* among those names which are definitely Gallic while Roudius appears to be

Gallic because of its -oudius ending.

46. These names are all found in the Index of CIL 6.

47. One would expect that since sagum was a Gallic cloak the sagarii would naturally be natives of Gaul. The inscriptional evidence at Rome, however, does not show this to be the case.

48. T.P. Wiseman, above n. 28, 158-160.

49. Three Cominii are found epigraphically at Volsinii, the tribe of which is Pomptina (CIL 11, 2755, 2756, 7329).

50. Compare the probable relationship between the senatorial Vinicii and the Vinicii of Narbo. For discussion, see M. Gayraud, Narbonne Antique (Paris, 1981), 154, 349.

51. T.P. Wiseman, above n. 29, 221-222.

52. Y. Burnand, "Senatores Romani ex Provinciis Galliarum Orti", Epigrafia E Ordine Senatorio (Roma, 1982), Vol. II, 387-437 at 420.

53. Wiseman, above n. 29, 228.

54. Some of the older Roman colonies were assigned to other tribes. For example, citizens of Narbo belonged either to the Pollian or Papirian tribes. Baeterrae belonged to the Pupinian while the Teretinian and Aniensian tribes were assigned respectively to the Arelate and Forum Julii.

55. Burnand, above n. 52, 420.

56. CIL 11, part 2, Fasc. 1, p. 608.

57. CIL 11, Vol. 2, fasc. 1, p. 753.

58. Stanley Burstein, "Cornelius Gallus and Aethiopia" AHB 2, (1988), 16-20 at 17, cf. CAH Vol. 10, 241.

59. R. Syme, above n. 23, 587.

60. Syme, above n. 23, argues that this Cornelius Lentulus may also have been the source of citizenship for the Spaniard, Cornelius Balbus.

61. Syme, "The Origin of Cornelius Gallus", CQ 32, (1938), 39-44 at 40. (Compare, however, Geza Alföldy [Der Obelisk auf dem Petersplatz in Rom, Heidelberg, 1990, 35] who writes that the exact location of his home-city is "umstritten".)

62. RE. 2, 1474, s.v. P. Alfenus Varus (8).

63. In fact, the whole reference to Forum Julii may well be the result of a misreading of an inscription on Hieronymus' part. Alföldy (above n. 61), reports the restoration of the inscription found on the obelisk which records that Cornelius Gallus constructed a "Forum Iulium" in Alexandria. It is not impossible that Hieronymus (or his source) mistook this Forum Julium to be, not his accomplishment, but his birthplace.

64. Syme, above n. 61, 40.

65. Evans, above n. 45, 359-360.

66. Syme, above n. 23, 783.

67. E. Wightman, Gallia Belgica (London, 1985), 51.

68. PIR^2, Vol. 4, p. 228, n. 381.

69. On Licinus, H.G. Pflaum, Les Procurateurs Equestres sous le Haut-Empire Romain (Paris, 1950), 134, writes "La Gaule ... constitue cette grand circonscription ou le fameux Licinus a exercé ses rapines".

70. The inscription reads: Dis Manib(us) ¦ Octaviae P(ubli) F(iliae) Catulae ¦ Celadi Divae August(ae) l(iberti) ¦ uxori (CIL 6, 2338). This could, of course, be a different Celadus.

71. Evans, above n. 45, 437.

72. These names are found in the Indices of CIL 12 and 13. R.G.M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, A Commentary on Horace: Odes Book I, (Oxford, 1970), 337, and E. Evans (above n. 34, 353) also refer to these examples of the name Iccius.

73. R. Syme, The Augustan Aristocracy (Oxford, 1986), 361 proposes that another of Horace's friends, Julius Florus (Epist. 1.3; 2.2) may have been Gallic. While it is possible that he was from Gaul, as were two other noted Julii Flori,

one an orator, the other a rebel, the name is not so distinctive, like Iccius, that one could say he must have originated from that country.

74. Pflaum, (Les fastes de la Province de Narbonnaise (Paris, 1978), 205, shows a number of instances where the title Caesar Augustus could mean any of the Julio-Claudian emperors.

75. PIR^2, I, 228, n. 382.

76. A.L.F. Rivet, (above n. 15, 150) is unable to date Aponius' flaminate at Baeterrae, though the fact that Augustus is not called divus indicates that the office was held before A.D. 14. The statement of H. Hanlein-Schafer Veneratio Augusti (Rome, 1985), 244, that L. Aponius was dead by A.D. 4 is nowhere found in the evidence we have.

77. cf. Liebenam, RE 10, 1819 s.v. "Duoviri" who cites other examples of men who proudly recorded that they were praefecti pro duoviri who had succeeded members of the Imperial family.

78. Evans, above n. 95, 181.

79. It is for this reason that Syme (above, n. 23, 594) assumes L. Aponius is a Spaniard.

80. These include L. Aponius L.I. Eros (CIL 12, 4612), L. Aponius, L.I. Felix (12, 4611), [L] Aponius L.I. Fr ... (12, 4478 add) and [L] Aponius [L] l. Optatus (12, 4612). There

are other L. Aponii whose patronage is not mentioned. All but one of these (CIL 12, 5808, found at Arelate) are from Narbo.

81. A. Pelletier "La Societé Urbaine en Gaule Narbonnaise à l'époque d'Auguste", Latomus 50 (1991), 645-654 at 650.

82. CIL 12, 331.

83. Gayraud, above n. 50, 367, also argues for the early first century on the grounds that another of Veiento's freedmen restored a temple during the reign of Nero.

84. C. Wells, The Roman Empire (Stanford, 1984), 138.

85. E. Paratore "Letteratura Pagana Nella Gallia Romana" La Gallia Romana (Roma, 1973) 53. However, Syme, "The Date of Justin and the Discovery of Trogus", Historia 37 (1987), has less flattering things to say about Trogus. He writes that Trogus was not documented before the Historia Augusta (365) and that he "may have been little better than a superior journalist (370-371). Syme seems mistaken, however, as Trogus, in fact, is found in the Elder Pliny (HN VII, 33; XI, 229, 274).

86. A. Klotz, RE XXI, 2, 2301, "Pompeius Trogus".

87. Klotz, above n. 85.

88. P.A. Brunt, "Princeps and Equites", JRS 73 (1983), 42-75 at 42 states that there were not enough senators to fill the

numerous administrative and military positions, so Augustus followed Maecenas' advise in using knights wherever necessary. Brunt adds, however, that numbers were only part of the reason for the elevation of the equites; Augustus was able to rely more safely on the loyalty of the knights.

89. M. Gayraud, above n. 50, 178, also A.L.F. Rivet, above n. 15, 134.

90. G.L. Cheeseman, The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army (Oxford, 1914), 64-65. Cheesman here notes ad rem, "The predominance of the auxilia of Spain and Gaul in the pre-Flavian period is, however, a clear indication of the determination of Augustus to base the Empire on its Western provinces".

91. So dated by the editors of CIL 13, p. 570.

92. Wightman, above n. 66, 72.

93. Hatt, above n. 35, 120.

94. Rivet, above n. 15, 342.

95. Pflaum, above n. 73, 195.

96. H.M.D. Parker, The Roman Legions, (Cambridge, 1958), 192.

97. Parker, above n. 95, 191.

98. It appears that this same Iustus was the praetorian prefect under Claudius in A.D. 43. Iustus was the praetorian prefect under Claudius in A.D. 43 (cf. PIR^2, Vol. 3, p. 131, n. 576).

99. E. Evans, above n. 45, 172-173.

100. The examples in Belgica include Catonius Catullinus (CIL 13, 4517) and L. Catonius Secundus (*ibid*. 6860) both of the Mediomatrici, Catonius Secundinus (*ibid*. 3990) of the Treveri and C. Catonius Respectus (*ibid*. 8588) of Asberg in Germania Inferior. For the suggestion that the Antonine senator, M. Macrinius Avitus Catonius Vindex, although born at Cologne, was originally from a Celtic region (see PIR^2 Vol. 5, p. 128, n. 25). Compare also Catonia Baudia (variant of Boudia?) (CIL 6,3594) found at Rome.

101. A centurion whose name comes up in Tacitus' narrative of the rebellion is Julius Clemens (Tac., *Ann*. 1.23; 1.26). Although it is impossible to say for certain, by virtue of his *nomen* he could conceivably be of Gallic origin.

102. The military inscriptions are found in CIL 13,8055-8095 (Bonna), 8267-8319 (Colonia Agrippinensis) and 8640-8655 (Vetera). Not all these soldiers are Gauls, though many are - particularly at Bonn.

103. *CAH*, Vol. 10, 645.

104. Stein suggests that the name Sacrovir may be found inscribed on the arch of Orange (RE, n. 452, p. 797, s.v. "Julius Sacerdos"). If so (and it is by no means certain), it would imply the arch commemorated the suppression of the A.D. 21 revolt.

105. While the Gauls often adopted ethnic cognomina which were either Italian (i.e., Sabinus, Vestinus) or more foreign (Africanus, Asiaticus, Punicus), the name Indus appears to be the most exotic. While the choice of these names perhaps varies from person to person, there is actually a story related by Pomponius Mela (Chor. 3.45), which concerns Indians in Belgica. He says that when Quintus Metellus Celer was governor of Gaul (62 B.C.), the King of the Boii gave him some Indians as a gift. These men were apparently explorers who had been thrown considerably off-course and who finally landed on the shores of Germany. Doubtless these strangers made quite an impression on the Germans or Belgic Gauls who encountered them and it was perhaps from the inevitable stories which arose that Julius Indus took that name.

106. Birley, above n. 33, 368.

107. Syme, above n. 23, 456. Classicianus (Ann. 14.38.3) married Iulia Indi f(ilia) Pacata (CIL. 7.30).

108. Rivet, above n. 15, 306.

109. Gayraud, above n. 50, 423.

110. A. Barrett, Caligula: The Corruption of Power (Yale, 1989), 162.

111. Burnand, above n. 52, 416.

112. H.E. Butler (Quintilian, (Cambridge, 1922) 445, translates it "mellowness".

113. Wiseman, above n. 29, 228.

114. Burnand, above n. 52, 411, disagrees with Syme, above n. 23, 20, who states that M. Iulius Graecinus was the older brother of Agricola.

115. Despite the allegations, Memmius Regulus "performed loyal service to Tiberius in the demolition of Aelius Sejanus"; cf. Syme (above n. 19), 177.

116. The most notable examples are C. Memmius Macrinus, duumvir of Massilia (CIL 5,7914) and possibly Memmia Galla (cf. PIR^2, Vol. 5, p. 249 f., n. 468), grandmother of Cottia Galla who came from an area of the Gallic Alps.

117. Syme, above n. 72, 177.

118. According to PIR^2, Vol. 5, n. 467, it was published in Tituli Urbani cryptae Praetextae, 28 (1973), 65.

119. In Narbonensis, for instance, there are six inscriptions to members of the Galerian tribe. Of these, three are or seem to be Lugdunese (CIL 12, 1750; 1918; 5412), one Spanish (ibid., 4536), and the remaining two (ibid., 4365; 4541) although unidentified, are probably one or the other.

120. There are 20 instances of the name found in the index of CIL 2.

121. The first, of course, was the Gaditane Cornelius Balbus who became consul in 40 B.C.

122. L. Maurin "Gaulois et Lyonnais", REA 88 (1986), 109.

123. Sabora (CIL 2,1430,5045,5046), together with its neighboring town Ostippo (CIL 2. 1459, 1460) has a greater number of Memmii, though admittedly most of those mentioned are freedmen.

124. Syme, above n. 23, 222.

125. R. Hanslik, RE, XXII.219.

126. Rivet, above n. 15, 54. Also Gayraud, above n. 50, 377 and 422.

127. R. Syme, "Cn. Domitius Corbulo" JRS 1970, 33.

128. Syme, above n. 126, 39.

129. Syme, above n. 126, 39.

130. Appropriately a Domitia Corbilla. A relative, perhaps of Domitius Corbulo?

131. P. Wuilleumier Inscriptions Latines des Trois Gaules (Paris, 1963), 48. Wuilleumier says that this name, found on an inscription at Gironde, is derived from another name, Crobus.

132. For another example of the development of Gallo-Roman names, note Bucco and its Latinized derivatives Bucconius, Buccinius, Buccionius, Buccius and Bucculius: M. Christol and D. Fishwick, "A Priest of the Three Gauls at Valentia" RAN 12 (1979), 282.

133. K.H. Schmidt, Die Komposition in Gallischen Personennamen (Tubingen, 1957), 295-296.

134. Evans, above n. 45, 387.

135. J. Whatmough, The Dialects of Ancient Gaul (Harvard, 1970), adds two names which may be relevant here, Betulo (p. 743) and Totulo (p. 1309). Another name, Stabulo (CIL 12.2591) might also belong to the category of proper names ending in -ulon.

136. R.A. Armstrong, A Gaelic Dictionary (London, 1825) 144. The word corb appears to be archaic, the modern form written as carbad.

137. Burnand, above n. 52, 420.

138. In Narbonensis, there are twenty-four instances of Celsus/a and six of Celsinus/a. While there are commoner names there (i.e. Felix, Montanus, Rufus, Saturninus) *Celsus* is easily one of the *cognomina* most frequently found in the province.

139. J.R. Hamilton, "The Date of Q. Curtius Rufus", *Historia* 37, (1988), 445-456, argues convincingly that the writer and senator were the same.

140. Burnand, above n. 52, 414.

141. E. Espérandieu, *Musée Calvet. Incriptions antiques* (Avignon, 1900), 48. Burnand, however, is quite skeptical.

142. Cf. K.H. Schmidt, above n. 132, 157, proposing a morpheme *-boudius*.

143. Perhaps also Eniboudius (*ILS* 4664).

144. R. Syme, "P. Calvisius Ruso: One Person or Two", *ZPE* 56, (1984), 190, adds that the name of the Raetian town, Abudiacum, may be etymologically connected to Abudius. One example of the name is found in Dalmatia at Iader - Abudia Maxima, *CIL* 3, 2938.

145. All the examples in Rome are M. Abudii, including M. Abudius Luminaris (*CIL* 6,9683) the patron of Abudia Megiste

and father of M. Abudius Saturninus. Also found is a certain M. Abudius Seleucus (6.12752).

146. Syme, above n. 143, 190.

147. Syme, above n. 143.

148. Birley, above n. 33, 368. These nobles, in turn, seem to have preferred, for obvious reasons of prestige and power, to recruit their cavalries from their own fellow-countrymen. For example, all the instances we know of the *ala Indiana* appear to be, like Julius Indus, Belgicans of some kind. Of the four instances found in *CIL* 13, 2, 13, nos. 6230 and 8519 name respectively a Namnitian and a Treveran. The other two examples of soldiers from the Indiana, *CIL* 7028 and 7257, are found in Moguntiacum and are probably either German or Gallic Belgicans. cf. Drinkwater, above n. 2, 829, n. 6: "I assume a free Gallic noble would have raised most of his own fighting men from his direct dependants, most of whom would have been his own countrymen".

149. Cichorius, *RE* 1, 1259.

150. Schmidt, above n. 132, 279. On the senator Togonius, R. Hanslik writes, "Sein name, der aus einem keltischen Individualnamen gebildet ist ..." (*RE* 2,12,1668 s.v. Togonius Gallus).

151. There is, admittedly an Iberian deity whose name Togotes (CIL 2,893) may be formed from the same morpheme.

152. Another name which may fit here is that of the British king, Togodubnus. Burnand states that, although the formation of Togonius appears Celtic, the name should not be assigned specifically as Gallic. This idea, however, is perhaps countered by the absence of the name in Cisalpine Gaul and Spain. In comparison, Togonius is relatively prevalent in Gaul.

153. Syme, above n. 23. 590. Syme lists three others who performed second consulates from 43 to 46. Of these Passienus Crispus and Marcus Vinicius were husbands of princesses while L. Vitellius was father of a future Emperor.

154. For those at Narbo, see n. 9. Those L. Aponii at Rome who are identified as freedmen of Lucius include Anthus (6.12166), Nicia(s) (6.4904) and Phileros (6.34468). Among the Aponiae who are Lucius' freedwomen, there are Chia (6.4909), Lanthanusa (6.12167), Thalassa (6.26832) and Horme (6.12166). There are other L. Aponii found at Rome which do not indicate patronage but who probably have some connection to the same familia.

155. R.D. Milns, "The Career of M. Aponius Saturninus", Historia 22, (1973), 284-294 at 292.

156. Syme, above n. 23, 784. Gayraud, above n. 50, 154, suggests that Votienus was a variant of the more common Vettienus, examples of which are found at Narbo.

157. R. Hanslik, RE IX.A 1, p. 119-120 s.v. "P. Vinicius".

158. Syme, above n. 23, 282.

159. The Younger Africanus was quoted by Quintilian as having said to Nero after Agrippina died, Rogant te, Caesar, tuae Galliae, ut felicitatem tuam fortiter feras, (Inst. 8.5.15). Two questions arise from this. The first is whether Africanus addressed Nero as a representative of "tuae Galliae", that is of the concilium Galliarum. If so, was Africanus' father also a representative of the concilium?

160. Syme, above n. 72, 361.

161. Of the 23 examples of either Montanus or Montana(ia) in CIL 13, 14 are found in Aquitania, the rest in Belgica. Obviously the Pyrennees and the Alps were the main influence in this name's distribution.

162. Syme, above n. 23, 385.

163. Syme, above n. 72, 100-101, comments that of the 17 men who held the consulship from A.D. 15-19, at least 10 were novi homines.

164. Syme, above n. 23, 622.

165. Consider Martial's contact with Seneca which seems to be alluded to in Epig. 4,40,2 and 12,36,3.

166. Both Fishwick, above n. 37, 133, and Wells, above n. 83, 139, date the construction to ca. A.D. 19.

167. King, above n. 5, 148.

168. Wells, above n. 83, 139.

169. Drinkwater, above n. 2, 849. Drinkwater suggests that Victor was probably a friend of the Roman governor which may have been Germanicus.

170. The editors of CIL 13 state that the name of Victor's father is found in Caesar's Commentaries, BG 7.3. That name, however, written Conconnetodumnus, refers to a leader of the Carnutes and not to a Santonian. They further write that the name Agedopamatis is also found on a Gallic coin (de la Tour Tab. XXV n. 16). Interestingly, the full name on the coin reads "Gaius Iulius Agedopamatis". Unless Victor failed to indicate that that was his grandfather's full name, we have to assume that they are two different men.

171. Stillwell, above n. 9, 563.

172. S. Demougin-M. Christol "La carrière d'un notable Narbonnais, au debût de Ier s. après J.C. (CIL 12, 4371 et 4372)", ZPE 49 (1982) 141-153.

173. The state of the Vocontii was, besides Massilia, the only ciuitas foederata in Narbonensis. Officially, at least, that meant it was independent. As late as the time of Claudius, a knight there was condemned for practising Druidism (Pliny, HN XXIX, 54).

174. Barrett, above n. 110, 132, suggests that, by virtue of his nomen, Sacerdos may have been an Imperial freedman or a descendant of one. While the name may have been taken for that reason, he may just as likely have been a descendant of a Gallic soldier who had been enfranchised either by Julius Caesar or Augustus.

175. The index of CIL 13 records such names similar to Iulius Sacerdos as Iulius Sacer (4388), Sacer Iulius (6233), Iulius Sacratus (4559), Iulius Sanctus (395), Iulia Sac... (1079), Iulia Sacrina (996) and Iulia Sancta (573).

176. Barrett, above n. 110, 138-139, is sceptical about this story, saying that it "sounds like fantasy, and has all the hallmarks of Suetonian exaggeration". He adds that few of the legionnaires would have still been serving twenty-five years later.

177. Evidence on papyri (PIR^2, Vol. 4, p. 181, n. 937) records ownership of property in Egypt by a certain Aponius Saturninus in the years A.D. 29, 31 and 34. This man is usually regarded as the same as our subject. While, however,

this proves he was wealthy, it does not automatically prove he was yet a member of the senate.

178. Milns, above n. 154, 288.

179. One name found here is L. Aponius Augustalis. This cognomen may be relevant to the fact that his patron, L. Aponius of Baeterrae, had served as the first *flamen Augusti* in his home-colony.

180. Milns, above n. 154, in contrast to P. Von Rohden, *RE* 3, p. 172, nn. 8, 9, 10, argues that this M. Aponius Saturninus and the one found in Tacitus' *Histories* are the same individual. Von Rohden holds that the two are father and son.

181. R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, (Oxford, 1939), 502.

182. P.J. Sijpesteijn, "Another *οὐσια* of D. Valerius Asiaticus in Egypt", *ZPE* 79 (1989), 194-196.

183. Sijpesteijn, above n. 181, estimates Asiaticus' birthdate on the basis of his attaining the consulship in A.D. 35.

184. Immediately after relating that story, Seneca wrote of Cassius Chaerea, the tribune who actually killed Caligula. Like Asiaticus, Chaerea's motive was based largely on vengeance. Caligula, it appears, often made insinuations about Chaerea's behaviour.

185. Syme, above n. 72, 319.

186. Syme, above, n. 72, 319.

187. For the nature of the marriage between Regulus and Paulina, see J.H. Oliver, "Lollia Paulina, Memmius Regulus and Caligula" Hesperia 35 (1966), 150-153.

188. Pflaum, above n. 73, 195-201.

189. Pflaum, ibid. 197-198.

190. Pflaum, above n. 73, 273.

191. Gelzer, RE 19, n. 133, p. 404.

192. Philo's exact words are: "Φίλων ἐνίων πατρίδας ὅλας τῆς 'Ρωμαϊκῆς ἠξίωσας πολιτείας" (Leg. 285).

193. Barrett, above n. 173, 21.

194. J. Colin, "Les consuls du césar-pharaon Caligula", Latomus 13 (1954), 394-416, at 411, believes that the consul whom Afer replaced was Cn. Domitius Corbulo. For arguments to the contrary, see above, p. 141.

195. PIR^2, Vol. 3, n. 126, p. 29.

196. Wiseman, above n. 29, 228.

197. Pliny's actual words are socios in liberis.

198. G.B. Townend "Traces in Dio Cassius of Cluvius, Aufidius and Pliny", Hermes 89 (1961), 227-248 at 234f.

199. See above n. 193.

200. Colin, above n. 193, uses this expression.

201. R. Syme, above n. 126, 30.

202. Syme, above n. 126, 31.

203. R.H. Rodgers "Curatores Aquarum", HSCP 86 (1982), 171-180 at 173.

204. Syme, above n. 23, 20. See also Barrett, above n. 110, 158.

205. Agricola himself developed the same philosophical inclination. He himself told Tacitus se (Agricolam) prima in iuventa studium philosophiae acrius, ultra quam concessum Romano ac senatori, hausisse ... (Agr. 4).

206. Burnand, above n. 52, 414.

207. This idea is further confirmed by the fact that Nero, under whom Burrus served from 54-62, is also not mentioned by name.

208. Josephus (AJ 29.17-18) writes that the plot actually brought together three different groups, all united in a common goal. Suetonius says that two previous conspiracies

had been detected before they could be put into effect (Calig. 56).

209. This mysterious figure, Aemilius Regulus, is not recorded in any other source. Barrett (above n. 173) 294, advances one possibility that the name should read Aemilius Rectus who was a friend of the philosopher, Canus. Another possibility, however, is that the nomen was copied incorrectly and that it should have read Memmius Regulus. This man certainly had legitimate personal reasons for wanting Caligula overthrown. Besides being compelled to divorce his wife Paulina, Memmius was later ordered to transport to Rome the statue of Olympian Zeus (Jos., AJ 19.9-10), an order which he refused. By refusing, he ran the risk of being executed, an action which, Josephus explains, he only avoided by Gaius' own death.

210. Saturninus recommended that Chaerea ought to be awarded with highest honours.

211. Syme, above n. 23, 783, lists the commonest names in the province and Cassius is the tenth commonest name there. The name Cassius is not found on the list of most frequent names in Spain.

212. Josephus similarly writes that Asiaticus proclaimed "Εἶθε γὰρ ἐγωγε" (AJ 19.159). Of Asiaticus' performance, Barrett, above n. 173, 175, writes "(Asiaticus') ambiguous

assertion that he wished he could claim to be the assassin might have been an attempt to play a double game, evading responsibility before the people but seeking to establish his credentials before the senate (and history)".

213. *PIR*^{2}, Vol. 1, n. 677, p. 115.

214. M. Vinicius, another name suggested as successor, was also Caligula's brother-in-law as he was married to Caligula's sister, Julia.

215. Another prominent and contemporary relative of the Lolliae was their elderly uncle, L. Volusius Saturninus. At the time of Caligula's assassination, he was the *praefectus urbi*. Although his name is not mentioned with regard to the conspiracy, he may have been, like so many others, at least cognizant of it.

216. L. Feldman, *Josephus* (Loeb Classical Texts; Cambridge, 1965) Vol. 9, 264. The Greek text presently reads "Ταλαιπωρουντίω", an obvious corruption. Presumably the Latin version was based on a manuscript in which Paulus was written more obviously.

217. R. Hanslik, *RE* XXI 2, pp. 2349-2350, s.v. "Q. Pomponius Secundus".

218. Hanslik, above n. 216.

219. Colin, above n. 193, 407.

220. Colin, above n. 173, 416.

221. Hatt, above n. 35, 128.

222. Ph. Fabia, "A propos de la table Claudienne", REA 1931, 118 and 225; also M.T. Griffin, "The Lyons Tablet and Tacitean Insight", CQ 32 (1982), 404-418 at 414.

223. F. Vittinghoff "Zur Rede des Kaisers Claudius über die Aufnahme von Galliern in den römischen Senat", Hermes 82 (1954), 348-371 at 355.

224. Vittinghoff, above n. 222, 370.

225. C.J. Simpson, "The Birth of Claudius", Latomus 46 (1987), 586-592, argues that Suetonius is correct in his claim that Claudius was born on the same day that the altar of Roma and Augustus was dedicated, that is, 10 B.C. This, however, contradicts the testimony of Livy, who states that the altar was dedicated in 12 B.C. While it has been suggested that the two-year difference can be explained by the circumstance that the altar was constituted in 12 B.C. but not officially dedicated until two years later, D. Fishwick, above n. 37, 97f., observes that in such a case the priest chosen in 12 B.C., C. Iulius Vercondaridubnus, could have performed no official rites until two years later. The sources can best be reconciled by taking Suetonius to mean that Claudius was born

on the anniversary of the dedication of the altar, two years later, that is, on its dies natalis.

226. V. Scramuzza, The Emperor Claudius (Cambridge, 1940), 143-144.

227. Wightman, above n. 66, 53.

228. Hatt, above, n. 35, 135.

229. No doubt while such amenities as the baths and theatres were for the enjoyment of his subjects, the primary reason for road-expansion was the efficient transportation of military personnel and supplies, particularly with regard to the campaign in Britain.

230. Scramuzza, above n. 225, lists twelve cities outside of Gaul which were raised to colonial status and nine towns, mostly in Noricum and Mauretania which were made municipia.

231. Cf. A. Momigliano, "Claudius Policy of Centralization" in From Augustus to Nero: The First Dynasty of Imperial Rome (East Lansing, Mich., 1990) 319, where he details Claudius' "ultimate goal".

232. In the following year, however, Pomponius, together with Annius Vinicianus and A. Caecina, joined with the governor of Dalmatia, L. Arruntius Fabius Scribonius Camillus, in rising up in an ill-fated attempt to overthrow Claudius. All of them

perished in this ill-fated attempt. Cf. A. Garzetti, From Tiberius to the Antonines (London, 1974; trans. J.R. Foster) 115.

233. One of the actual assassins, Cornelius Sabinus, was released by Claudius (Jos., AJ XIX, 273), Dio 60 3.4-5) though he committed suicide nonetheless out of loyalty to his fellow conspirators. Some senators were killed by the onslaught of Germans avenging Caligula, though none was actually tried and executed.

234. G.B. Townend, "Traces of Dio Cassius in Cluvius, Aufidius and Pliny" Hermes 89 (1961), 227-248 at 237, makes a strong case against the view that it was the elder Corbulo (Tac., Ann. 3.31) and not the general who was responsible for the harassment of the officials.

235. Evans, above n. 45, 173.

236. See above, n. 100, for a list of the Catonii of Belgica.

237. PIR^2, Vol. 2, n. 576, p. 131.

238. Parker, above n. 95, 201.

239. Another example of an aged and trusted prefect is L. Seius Strabo whose son became his colleague in A.D. 14 (Tac., Ann. 1.24).

240. The other prefect, Rufrius Pollio, served from 41-44, cf. PIR^2 Vol. 2, n. 3, p. 1202.

241. A certain Catonia Iusta is epigraphically attested as the daughter of a certain M. Catonius Threptus (CIL 6, 13493). Threptus may have been a freedman or a descendant of a freedman of the prefect, Catonius Iustus.

242. P.A. Gallivan, "The Fasti for the reign of Claudius" CQ 28 (1978), 407-426 at 420. Also G. Barbieri, "I consoli del'anno 43 d.c." RAL 30 (1975), 153 ff. Previously, it was assumed that Curtius Rufus had been consul in A.D. 45 (PIR^2, Vol. 2, p. 394, n. 1618) though Gallivan argues that the Rufus who was consul in that year (cf Jos., AJ 20.14) was a certain Antonius Rufus.

243. Some commentators, notably P. Grimal, Tacite, Librarie Artheme Fayard, Paris, 1990, 292, and J.R. Hamilton, above n. 138, 456, have argued that the consul for A.D. 43 and the historian/ biographer of Alexander are the same individual. Tacitus, at all events, makes no mention of this individual's literary accomplishments.

244. P.A. Holder, The Roman Army in Britain (London, 1982), 15.

245. Syme, above n. 72, 183, notes that the son of Crassus Frugi, Pompeius Magnus, became Claudius' son-in-law. Both

father and son eventually perished under that same Emperor.

246. E.T. Salmon A History of the Roman World 30 B.C. to A.D. 138 (London, 1972) 180.

247. Holder, above n. 243, 21.

248. Holder, ibid. 107-124.

249. Syme, above n. 23, 108 and 462.

250. Cf. CIL 13, Part 5, Index, p. 134: "Helvetii aetatis antiquioris viritim censentur in Fabia".

251. Drinkwater, above n. 2, 817-850.

252. Evans, above n. 234, 160, 161 and K.-H. Schmidt, above n. 132, 160-161.

253. As were the eunuch Posides and other viri militares (Suet., Claud. 28).

254. According to Pliny, the Gauls presented Claudius in recognition of his victory in Britain with more gold than any other group (HN 33.34).

255. Tacitus writes immediately before that the lot was increasingly disregarded as they tended to fall upon less suitable people (quia sors deerrabat ad parum idoneos, Ann. 13.29).

256. Pflaum, above n. 73, 207. Although a tenure from 44-47 is the generally agreed one (cf. R.E. 9, 1426; PIR^2 Vol. 3, n. 47), such a period would in Roman counting amount to a four year term. For this reason, M. Corbier L'Aerarium Saturni et L'Aerarium Militare, Rome, 1974, 69, suggests 44-46.

257. Burnand, above n. 52, 422.

258. A. Reifferscheid, (ed.), C. Suetonius Tranquillus-Praeter Caesarum Libros Reliquiae (Hildesheim, 1971), 128.

259. R.E., XXI 1, 35, n. 47. s.v. Ti. Plautius Silvanus Aelianus (Hofmann).

260. Pflaum, above n. 73, 299, citing W. Eck.

261. Pflaum, above n. 73, ibid.

262. Gallivan, above n. 241, 425.

263. Scramuzza, above n. 225, 94, writes that "... antagonism to an aristocrat for being consul a second time, especially if he was wealthy, is foreign to the spirit of the Roman people".

264. Syme, above n. 73, 183.

265. Asiaticus may, for instance, have constructed a theatre in Vienna, no doubt as a mark of goodwill but also in order to curry favour with his fellow townsmen. This possibility is suggested by an inscription at Vienna (CIL 12, 1929) attesting

Scaenici Asiaticiani.

266. cf. Grimal, above, n. 242, 288, "... Messaline, aidée par L. Vitellius (le père du futur empereur), avait, par une ruse criminelle, emporté la condemnation alors que Claude semblait enclin à l'indulgence".

267. Syme, above n. 23, 610, argues, however, that Asiaticus' glorification was largely the achievement of his fellow Narbonensian, Cornelius Tacitus.

268. Translated by E. Cary Cassius Dio (Cambridge, 1925; Loeb ed.) 5.

269. A. Garzetti, above n. 232, 114.

270. Scramuzza, above n. 225, 93.

271. Perhaps, like M. Vinicius, he had spurned Messalina's advances (CD 60.27,4).

272. Scramuzza, above n. 225, 96-97.

273. Scramuzza, ibid. n. 225, 95.

274. G. Webster, The Roman Imperial Army (New Jersey, 1979), 273.

275. P.T. Eden, (ed). Seneca - Apocolocyntosis (Cambridge, 1984) 140.

276. Scramuzza, above, n. 225, 105, calls Claudius' speech the "Magna Carta" of Romanized Gaul.

277. R. Wellesley "Can you trust Tacitus?", Greece and Rome, 1 (1954), 13-35 at 15.

278. Wellesley, above n. 276, 32.

279. N.P. Miller, "The Claudian Tablet and Tacitus - A Reconsideration" Rheinisches Museum, 99 (1956), 304-315 at 314.

280. Wellesley, above n. 276, 22.

281. Griffin, above n. 221, 409.

282. For the distinction between Italians and provincials in the Senate, see R.J.A. Talbert, The Senate of Imperial Rome (Princeton, 1989), 32.

283. M. Hammond, "Composition of the Roman Senate A.D. 68-235", JRS 47 (1957), 71-81 at 78.

284. PIR^2, Vol. 4, n. 622, p. 292-93.

285. Griffin, above n. 221, 411.

286. Scramuzza, above n. 225, 102.

287. Wellesley, above n. 276, 15.

288. Syme, above n. 23, 786; cf. also Rivet, above n. 15, 306.

289. The Corneli Balbi were named in Tacitus' account, though given their absence historically, they may have died out by this time.

290. J.B. Hainsworth, "Verginius and Vindex", Historia 11, (1962), 86-96 at 88.

291. Syme, above n. 23, 461. Also see A.J. Christopherson, above n. 38, 362.

292. Cf. Maurin, above n. 121, 1-4.

293. Wightman, above n. 66, 66.

294. Syme, above n. 23, 621 and Evans, above n. 45, 387.

295. Talbert, above n. 281, 15. Syme, above n. 23, 800, suggests that Aper may have held the quaestorship before Claudius' censorship, not that there is any proof.

296. PIR^2, Vol. 4, pp. 265-266, n. 523.

297. H.G. Pflaum, "La chronologie de la carrière de Caesennius Sospes", Historia 2 (1954), 431-450 at 446.

298. PIR^2, Vol.4, pp. 264-265, n. 523.

299. Syme, above n. 23, 800, assumes he is Narbonese for that reason.

300. Pflaum, above n. 296.

301. Cf. Groag in RE, 19, p. 803, n. 472, noting that Wilmanns and Dessau believe Secundus was legate of Baetica, Mommsen and Willems hold that he was legate of Numidia, and Pallu de Lessert takes Secundus to have been legate of Legion VII.

302. Syme, above n. 23, 800.

303. Pflaum, above n. 73, 301.

304. The name, Duvius, is itself rare though its -uvius ending may perhaps be found in such other Celtic names as Etuvius (AE, 1902, 41), Esuvius (the family name of the Gallic Emperor Tetricus) and perhaps even Danuvius.

305. Pflaum, above n. 255, 301.

306. The order of his cursus is taken from Burnand, above n. 52, 414.

307. Given that his name is sometimes written Dubius (cf. Pliny, NH 34.47), could Statius have been thinking of Avitus when he wrote pessimus in dubiis augur timor, Theb. 3.6?

308. Another important component of Claudius' policy was the prohibition of Druidism throughout Gaul. Tiberius had forbidden the same cult earlier and from Claudius' action shows that the initial decree had been largely ignored. Claudius demonstrated his own determination to eradicate Druidism thoroughly; Pliny the Elder writes that a Vocontian knight was executed for carrying a serpent's egg which was considered a Druidic symbol (HN 29. 54).

309. Griffin, above n. 221, 407.

310. Syme, above n. 23, 787.

311. We do know, however, that his colleague, Q. Veranius, became legate of Lycia. cf. Talbert, above n. 281, 404.

312. Klass, in RE , n. 21, 2275-76, s.v. C. Pompeius Longus Gallus.

313. Syme, above n. 23, 787, prefers this form to Longus.

314. Scramuzza, above n. 225, 160.

315. Talbert, above n. 281, 140.

316. O. Rossbach, "L. Annaeus Seneca" RE, n. 17, p. 2442.

317. Rossbach, above n. 315, ibid.

318. Another name which emerged during the reign of Nero is Statius Ursulus, an orator from Tolosa (Suet., Rel. (Reiff.)

128,6).

319. Pflaum, above n. 73, 289.

320. PIR^2, Vol. 5, p. 108, n. 414.

321. While Gallic origin is always possible in such a case, the name Julius is insufficient in itself to prove the point.

322. For want of evidence it is impossible to tell whether these benefactions were built with money from the imperial coffers or from a local magnate.

323. Syme, above n. 73, 790; cf. also Tac., Ann. 15.25,3.

324. Syme, above n. 23, 592.

325. Burnand, above n. 52, 435-436.

326. Syme, above n. 143, 191, writes: "About the time when the first Calvisius Ruso became consul (i.e., A.D. 53), powerful influences were active in promoting Narbonensian senators". Syme is obviously thinking of Burrus, Seneca, et al.

327. Syme, above n. 23, 786.

328. Among the more famous intermarriages are those between Seneca himself and Pompeia Paulina, and later between Trajan and the Nemausan (Pompeia) Plotina. As an additional

connection, one might also include the possibly Spanish Memmius Regulus who served as patron of the Narbonese colony of Ruscino.

329. V. Scramuzza, "The Personality of Claudius", in _From Augustus to Nero: The First Dynasty of Imperial Rome_ (Michigan State Press, 1990), 310-316 at 311.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alfoldi, G. Der Obelisk auf dem Petersplatz in Rom, Heidelberg, 1990.

Balsden, J.P.V.D. Romans and Aliens, London, 1974.

Barnes, T.D. "Significance of Tacitus' Dialogus de Oratoribus", HSPH 90 (1986), 225-244.

Barrett, A. Caligula, Yale, 1989.

Barrett, A. "Claudius' British Victory Arch", Britannia 22 (1991), 1-19.

Barzano, A. "La distruzione del campidoglio nell'anno 69" CISA (1984), 107-120.

Bellen, H. "Die Rolle der Mainzer Legionen in der Krise des romischen Kaisertums 68-70 n. Chr", MZ 82 (1987), 111-122.

Benario, H. "Tacitus, Trier and the Treveri", CJ 83 (1988), 233-239.

Birley, E. The Roman Army, Amsterdam, 1988.

Birley, E. "The Enigma of Calvisius Ruso", ZPE 51 (1983), 263-269.

Birley, E. "Senators in the Emperor's Service", P. Brit. Acad. 39, (1953).

Braund, D.C. "Aedui, Troy and the Apocolocyntosis", CQ 30 (1980), 420-425.

Burnand, Y. "Senatores Romani ex Provinciis Galliarum Orti", Epigraphia E Rodine Senatorio, Roma, 1982, 387-437.

Burstein, S. "Cornelius Gallus and Aethiopia", AHB II (1988), 16-20.

Campbell, D.B., "The Consulship of Agricola" ZPE 63 (1986), 197-200.

Campbell, J.B., The Emperor and the Roman Army 31 B.C.-A.D. 235, Oxford, 1985.

Castritius, H. "Zu den Frauen der Flavier", Historia 18 (1969), 492-502.

Cheeseman, G.L., The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army, Oxford, 1914.

Chevallier, R., "Gallia Narbonensis. Bilan de 25 ans de recherches historiques et archéologiques", ANRW II 3, 686-828.

Chevallier, R., "Gallia Lugdunensis. Bilan de 25 ans de recherches historiques et archéologiques", ANRW II 3, 860-1060.

Christol M. and S. Demougin, "La carrière d'un notable Narbonnais au début de Ier s. après J.C., (CIL. XII 4371 et 4372)", ZPE 49 (1982), 141-153.

Christol, M. and D. Fishwick, "A Priest of the Three Gauls at Valentia", RAN 12 (1979).

Christopherson, A.J., "The Provincial Assembly of the Three Gauls", Historia 17 (1968), 351-366.

Clarke G.W., "The Treveri and the Tribute in Tacitus", Historia 14 (1965), 335-341.

Colin, J., "Les consuls du César-Pharaon Caligula", Latomus 13 (1954), 394-416.

Colin, J., "Senateurs Gaulois à Rome et gouverneurs romains en Gaule au IIIe siècle", Latomus 13 (1959), 218-228.

Daly, L.J., "Verginius at Vesontio: the Incongruity of the Bellum Neronis", Historia 24 (1975), 75-100.

Deman, A. and M. Raepsaet-Chartier, Les Inscriptions Latines de Belgique, Brussels, 1985.

Desjardins, E., Géographie historique et administrative de la Gaule Romaine, Brussels, 1968.

Dessau, H., Inscriptiones Latinae Selectae, Berlin, 1962.

Devijver, M., "The Career of M. Porcius Narbonensis (CIL 2.4239)", AncSoc. 3 (1972), 165-191.

Dewitt, N., "Druids and Romanization", TAPA 69 (1938), 319-332.

Drinkwater, J.R., Roman Gaul - The Three Provinces, London, 1983.

Drinkwater, J.R., "The Rise and Fall of the Gallic Julii", Latomus 37 (1978), 817-850.

Dyson, S., "Native Revolts in the Roman Empire", Historia 20 (1971), 239-274.

Ebel, C., Transalpine Gaul - The Emergence of a Province, Leiden, 1976.

Eck, W., "M. Pompeius Silvanus, cons. designatus tertium", ZPE 9 (1972), 259-275.

Eck, W., "Jahres - und Provincialfasten der Senatorischen Statthholder von 69/70 bis 138/139", Chiron 12 (1982), 281-362.

Eck, W., "Erganzungen zu den Fasti consulare des 1 und 2 Jh n. Chr.", Historia 24 (1975), 324-344.

Esperandieu, E., Musee Calvet. Inscriptions Antiques, Avignon, 1900.

Evans, E., Gaulish Personal Names, Oxford, 1967.

Fishwick, D., The Imperial Cult in the Latin West, Leiden, 1987.

Fishwick, D., "60 Gallic Tribes and the Altar of the Three Gauls", Historia 38 (1989), 111-112.

Gallivan, P., "The Fasti For the Reign of Claudius", CQ 28 (1978), 407-426.

Gallivan, P., "Some comments on the Fasti for the Reign of Nero", CQ 24 (1974), 290-311.

Gallotta, B., "Cn. Domizio Corbulone", RIL 112 (1978), 305-317.

Garnsey, P. and R. Saller, The Roman Empire, London, 1987.

Gayraud, M., Narbonne Antique, Paris, 1981.

Gayraud M., "Narbonne aux trois premiers siècles après Jésus-Christ", ANRW II.3, 829-859.

Griffin, M.T., Nero - The End of a Dynasty, Yale, 1985.

Griffin, M.T., "The Lyons Tablet and Tacitean Hindsight", CQ 32 (1982), 404-418.

Hainsworth, J.B., "Verginius and Vindex", Historia II (1962), 86-96.

Hamilton, J.R., "The Date of Q. Curtius Rufus", Historia 37 (1988), 445-456.

Hammond, M., "Composition of the Senate A.D. 68-235", JRS 47 (1957), 74-81.

Hatt, J., Gaule Romaine, Paris, 1959.

Hirschfeld, O. and K. Zangemeister, Corpus Inscriptionum Latinarum v. 13, Berlin, 1899.

Holder, P.A., The Roman Army in Britain, London, 1982.

Jullian, C., Histoire de la Gaule, Paris, 1920.

King, A., Roman Gaul and Germany, London, 1990.

Larson, J.A.O., Representative Government in Greek and Roman Society, Berkeley, 1955.

Last H., "Rome and the Druids: A Note", JRS 39 (1949), 1-5.

MacKendrick, P., Roman France, New York, 1972.

Maier, U., Caesars Feldzuge in Gallien, 58-51, Bonn, 1978.

Matthews, J., Western Aristocracies and Imperial Court, Oxford, 1975.

Maurin, L. "Gaulois et Lyonnais’, REA 88 (1984), 1-4.

Miller, N.P., "The Claudian Tablet and Tacitus: A Reconstruction", Rhein. Mus. 97 (1956), 304-315.

Milns, J., "The Career of M. Aponius Saturninus", Historia 22 (1973), 284-294.

Oliver, J.H., "Lollia Paulina, Memmius Regulus and Caligula", Hesperia 35 (1966), 150-153.

Paratore, E., "Letteratura Pagana nella Gallia romana", La Gallia Romana, Roma, 1973.

Parker, H., The Roman Legions, Cambridge, 1958.

Pelletier, A., "La societé urbaine en Gaule Narbonnaise à l’epoque d’Auguste", Latomus 50 (1991), 645-654.

Pflaum, H.G., Les Fastes de la Province de Narbonnaise, Paris, 1978.

Pflaum, H.G., Les Procurateurs Equestres sous le haut-empire Romain, Paris, 1950.

Pflaum, H.G., Les Carrières Procuratoriennes Equestres sous le Haut-Empire Romain, Paris, 1960.

Pflaum, H.G., "La chronologie de la carrière de L. Caesennius Sospes", *Historia* 2 (1954), 431-450.

Price, S.R.F., *Rituals and Power: The Roman Imperial Cult in Asia*, Cambridge, 1984.

Rice-Holmes, T., *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, Oxford, 1931.

Richmond, I.A., "Cnaeus Julius Agricola", *JRS* 34 (1944), 34.

Rivet, A.L.F., *Gallia Narbonensis - Southern France in Roman Times*, London, 1988.

Rodgers, R.H., "Curatores Aquarum", *HSPh* 86 (1982), 171-180.

Rupprecht, G., "Gaius Vettius Rufus consul suffectus a.p. Christ 36", *RAN* 7 (1974), 203-205.

Salviat, F., "Q. Curtius Rufus", *RAN* 19 (1986), 101-116.

Schillinger-Hafele, U., "Claudius und Tacitus uber die Aufnahme von Galliern in den Senat", *Historia* 14 (1965), 443-454.

Schmidt, K.H., *Die Komposition in Gallischen Personennamen*, Tubingin, 1957.

Scramuzza, V., *The Emperor Claudius*, Boston, 1940.

Scramuzza, V., "The Personality of Claudius", *From Augustus to Nero: The First Dynasty of Imperial Rome*, East Lansing, 1990.

Sherwin-White, A.N., *The Roman Citizenship*, Oxford, 1973.

Sherwin-White, A.N., *Racial Prejudice in Ancient Rome*, Cambridge, 1967.

Shotter, D.C.A., "A Time-Table for the *Bellum Neronis*", *Historia* 24 (1975), 59-74.

Sijpesteijn, P.J., "Another *οὐσια* of D. Valerius Asiaticus in Egypt", *ZPE* 79 (1989), 194-196.

Simpson, C.J., "The birth of Claudius and the Date of Dedication of the Altar *Romae et Augusto* at Lyon", *Latomus* 45 (1987), 586-592.

Speidel M. (ed), *Roman Army Studies*, Amsterdam, 1984.

Strobel, K., "Legio V. Alaudae in Moesia", *Historia* 37 (1988), 504-508.

Syme, R., The Roman Revolution, Oxford, 1939.

Syme, R., Tacitus, Oxford, 1958.

Syme, R., The Roman Aristocracy, Oxford, 1986.

Syme, R., "Some Notes on the Legions under Augustus", JRS 23 (1933), 14-33.

Syme, R., "The Origin of Cornelius Gallus", CQ 32 (1938), 39-44.

Syme, R., "Roman Names in Annals I-VI", JRS 39 (1949), 6-18.

Syme, R., "Domitius Corbulo", JRS 60 (1970), 27-39.

Syme, R., "Partisans of Galba", Historia 31 (1982), 460-483.

Syme, R., "Problems about Proconsuls of Asia", ZPE 53 (1983), 191-208.

Syme, R., "P. Calvisius Ruso, one person or two?", ZPE 56 (1984), 173-192.

Syme, R., "More Narbonensian Senators", ZPE 65 (1986), 1-24.

Syme, R., "The Date of Justin and the Discovery of Trogus", Historia 37 (1988), 258-317.

Talbert, R., The Senate of Imperial Rome, Princeton, 1984.

Townend, G.B., "Traces in Dio Cassius of Cluvius, Aufidius and Pliny", Hermes 89 (1961), 227-248.

Urban, R., Der "Bataverstand" und die Erhebung des Iulius Classicus, Trier, 1985.

Urban, R., "Historicae Phillippicae bei Pompeius Trogus", Historia 31 (1982), 81-96.

Vinson, M., "Domitia Longina, Julia Titi and the Literary Tradition", Historia 38 (1989), 431-450.

Vittinghof, F., "Zur rede des Kaisers Claudius uber die Aufnahme von Galliern in der romischen Senat", Hermes 82 (1954), 348-371.

Ward-Perkins, J.B., "The Career of Sex. Julius Frontinus", CQ 31 (1937), 102-105.

Webster, G., The Roman Imperial Army, New Jersey, 1985.

Wellesley, R., "Can You Trust Tacitus?", Greece and Rome 1 (1954), 13-35.

Wells, C.M., The German Policy of Augustus, Oxford, 1972.

Wells, C.M., The Roman Empire, Stanford, 1984.

Whatmough, J., The Dialects of Ancient Gaul, Cambridge, Mass., 1970.

Wightman, E., Roman Trier and the Treveri, London, 1970.

Wightman, E., Gallia Belgica, London, 1985.

Wightman, E., "Peasants and Potentates: An Investigation of Social Structure and Land-Tenure in Roman Gaul", AJAH 4 (1979), 97-128.

Wiseman, T.P., New Men in the Roman Senate 139 B.C.-A.D. 14, Oxford, 1971.

Wiseman, T.P., "Two More Senators", CQ 59 (1965), 158-160.

Wolff, H., "Civitas und Colonia Treverorum", Historia 26 (1977), 204-242.

Wuilleumeir, P., Inscriptions Latines des Trois Gaules, Paris, 1963.